PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

JAN 18 1949

The Antioch Review

Volume Eight · · · Winter 1948-49 · · · Number Four

The Job of the 81st Congress

Walter White — Lewis Corey
Rufus Terral — William G. Carleton
Heinz Eulau — Chat Paterson
Theodore Morgan

Writing in the USSR —Robert Magidoff

Road to Conservation—Whitney R. Cross

Short fiction by Harris Downey, E. W. Kenworthy

James G. Patton, George R. Geiger, W. McNeil Lowry, Peter Kihss, Kenneth Hunt, Sidney Harcave, Louis Filler

PUBLISHED FOUR TIMES A YEAR AT YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO
SUBSCRIPTION THREE DOLLARS A YEAR · · SINGLE COPIES SEVENTY-FIVE CENTS

Books of Lasting Interest

EXECUTIVE ABILITY: Its Discovery and Development

by Glen U. Cleeton and Charles W. Mason

A study of the executive in today's society: his social and economic functions, the personality traits essential to success, and techniques for finding and developing these traits. $4.50

THE FIRST FISH and Other Stories

by Warren Beck

Thirteen stories by a master of the form. For those who like their fiction written with perception, compassion, and clarity. $2.50

REPRESENTATIVE BUREAUCRACY: An Interpretation of the British Civil Service

by J. Donald Kingsley

A penetrating examination of the development and the characteristics of bureaucracy in today's middle-class State. A book which sheds new light on a major public question: the social and political implications of bureaucracy. $3.50

MAKING WORK HUMAN

by Glen U. Cleeton

What is being done and what can be done to humanize industrial relations and to regain for the factory worker the pride and satisfaction of the artisan. *To be published this spring*

—Send for our complete catalog—

THE ANTIOCH PRESS

Yellow Springs, Ohio

Associated with Antioch College

STRATEGIC AREA MAPS

THESE are wall maps, in one color, for Political Science, Geography, and History classrooms, and for any spot where World Affairs are being studied and discussed. The size is 44x60 inches. They are edited by Dr. Norman J. Padelford of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

AVAILABLE also in desk size for student use (8½x11 inches). Write for Circular No. G8AR.

Published and distributed by

Denoyer-Geppert Company

5235 Ravenswood Avenue **Chicago 40, Ill.**

Contents

THE JOB OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The Control of Inflation ..... *Theodore Morgan* 387

Housing ..... *Chat Paterson* 393

Organized Labor ..... *Lewis Corey* 398

Foreign Relations ..... *William G. Carleton* 400

Western Conservation ..... *Rufus Terral* 404

Civil Liberties in a Favorable Climate ..... *Walter White* 409

Civil Liberties—a Democratic Victory ..... *Heinz Eulau* 412

FULL EMPLOYMENT: A PROPOSAL ..... *James G. Patton* 417

MR. TODD . . . . *a Story* ..... *Harris Downey* 425

THE ROAD TO CONSERVATION ..... *Whitney R. Cross* 432

PHILOSOPHIC HUMANISM TODAY ..... *George R. Geiger* 447

WANDERER'S RETURN ..... *W. McNeil Lowry* 463

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS ..... *Peter Kihss* 469

WRITING IN THE USSR ..... *Robert Magidoff* 481

NEAR INDEPENDENCE SQUARE . . . . *a Poem* ..... *Dan G. Hoffman* 489

WITHOUT PREJUDICE . . . . *a Documentary* ..... *E. W. Kenworthy* 490

BOOKS

Road to Survival ..... *Kenneth Hunt* 505

Gandhi's "Confession" ..... *Sidney Harcave* 507

Book Notes ..... *Louis Filler* 509

The ANTIOCH REVIEW

VOLUME VIII Published in December, 1948 NUMBER 4

Copyright 1948, by The Antioch Review, Incorporated, Yellow Springs, Ohio. Contributions to THE ANTIOCH REVIEW may not be reprinted in whole or in part without the permission of the Editors.

The ANTIOCH REVIEW

"Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

—ABRAHAM LINCOLN

- *Editorial Board* -

PAUL BIXLER

W. B. ALEXANDER
VALDEMAR CARLSON*
FREEMAN CHAMPNEY
LOUIS FILLER
GEORGE R. GEIGER
ALBERT W. LIDDLE
HERMAN SCHNURER
JOHN C. SPARKS

MAX ASTRACHAN, *Business Manager*

*On leave of absence.

Indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*

Published at Yellow Springs, Ohio, in March, June, September, and December by THE ANTIOCH REVIEW, Incorporated, a non-profit organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio. THE ANTIOCH REVIEW is not an official publication of Antioch College and the views expressed in its columns are not necessarily those of the College. Subscription rates: $3.00 the year; Canadian, $3.50; Foreign, $4.00. Single copies, 75 cents.

Contributions should be sent to The Editors of THE ANTIOCH REVIEW, Yellow Springs, Ohio. Unsolicited manuscripts which are found unavailable for publication will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The Editors assume no responsibility for the views expressed by contributors of articles.

Publication Office, 212 Xenia Avenue, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

Entered as second-class matter, March 22, 1941 at the post office at Yellow Springs, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE JOB *of the* 81st CONGRESS

President Truman stressed the issues and won the election. Governor Dewey, ignoring the issues, lost. That, we submit, is the central postelection fact. Whether the President helped to elect Democratic congressional candidates as happened in some states and some districts, or whether the Democratic candidates helped to elect him as occurred in other areas, the telling issues were clothed in terms of the failure of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. Presumably the Eighty-first Congress will do what the Eightieth did not. Yet it is not so much to past failures or to personalities, but primarily to positive solutions to problems, that the new Congress should address itself.

It is with this in mind that we publish the seven brief articles in the following pages. Not that anyone will find here a complete catalog. We have had, unhappily, to leave out social security, health, and aid to education; we have not included anything about a farm program or on the "more-or-less" question of national defense. But the central problems—control of inflation, housing, foreign relations, labor, conservation, civil liberties—are here. And one, civil liberties, is worthy of the double treatment it receives. (We add, parenthetically, that the treatment of each issue is principally due to the author, not to our editorial directives.)

A good part of the liberal's present hopes are pinned on the job of the Eighty-first Congress. That job looms as gigantic. But we think the newly elected body of federal legislators have it in them to deal positively with these issues and thereby to bring off the most formidable accomplishment in congressional history.

THE CONTROL OF INFLATION

By THEODORE MORGAN

INFLATION is a continuing rise in general prices. It is evidence of too much spending just as plainly as depression and unemployment are evidences of too little spending. Suppose that consumers, businesses, and government are spending at the rate of $200 billions a year on current production, and that this expenditure is sufficient to purchase the full employment output of the economy. Then suppose that these groups raise their spending to $220 billions. Prices must rise by 20/200, or by 10 per cent. The only way for $220 billions to be spent on an output formerly selling for $200 billions is for prices to rise by that proportion.

THEODORE MORGAN is Associate Professor of Economics at the University of Wisconsin. He is the author of *Income and Employment* (1947) and of *Hawaii: a Century of Economic Change*, just published by the Harvard University Press.

If we ask where the excess spending comes from, we must look to the financing and production phenomena of war. War increases the money supply and intensifies need, and in many countries its dislocations and destruction have cut productive capacity. The crucial cause is that no government, in time of major war, has been able to meet its expenses from the money it gets out of the public, that is, by taxing and by borrowing from the public. The difference is made up by new money—printed, or created by the banking system. Japan's money supply rose by early 1948 to 60 times the prewar level; Germany's, to 10 or 12 times; even the United States had by late 1948 increased its money supply to 2.7 times that of 1939.

And so the fires of inflation have been circling the earth, in "controlled" as well as "free" economies—in England and Soviet Russia, as in China and the United States. Former neutrals reflect the same trouble. *We* are lucky: we think we have been having inflation, but the United States dollar remains literally good as gold to people in other countries of the world. By late 1948 our wholesale prices were 218 per cent of their 1939 level; but in Hungary by July, 1946, prices were 4,000 *septillion* times the 1939 level.

But even a moderate inflation has its acute disadvantages, and we have rightly been concerned about how to put an end to it. We can help ourselves to think straight by looking at fallacies which have been in the wind in recent months.

(1) There is a whole set of errors associated with the doctrine that increased production can smother inflation. But if an economy is already at full employment, as that of the United States has steadily been since 1942, can production be substantially increased? The answer of course is No. Increased productivity can help out somewhat; but it is not likely that productivity can rise faster than 2 to 3 per cent a year. This will not help out much within several years.

(2) A special case of this general argument was pressed during the year following V-J day. If only the wartime price ceilings were lifted, we were told, production would bound upward so vigorously that prices must soon fall to ceiling levels or below. The inflation would collapse. The emptiness of this doctrine was soon proved by the facts, in the months following removal of price ceilings in 1946. The reason is plain. The economy was approximately at full employment. Any possible increase

in production in one industry—where say, prices had been so low as to discourage production—would be offset by a drop in production elsewhere, as men and materials were bid away from other employments.

But it is easy to understand, too, how manufacturers, farmers, and employees, fretting under ceiling prices on *their* products and services, could manage to persuade themselves that the doctrine was sound.

(3) Not much different was the remarkable theory adopted by Congress in early 1948, that lower taxes and lower government revenues would help check inflation. Business investment was supposed to be encouraged by lower taxes, and with more plant and equipment in use, production would soon rise. But heavier expenditure for plant and equipment—if in fact it resulted—would add to inflationary pressure *now,* and the hoped-for rise in output could not be significant until some years in the future. This is no escape from today's inflation.

(4) Then there is the scapegoat theory of inflation. Just as the above are right-wing fallacies, so this is usually a fallacy of the left—profiteers and hoarders are blamed. But sometimes unions and union leaders bear the brunt—John L. Lewis, a more than proportionate share.

It is human enough to seize on convenient targets for our irritation. Unfortunately, the scapegoat theory, as an important explanation of inflation, is brought up short by the facts. Prices have not risen more than pressures, from both the demand and cost sides, have tended to raise them. Disposable income available for spending was in the fall of 1948 at 276 per cent of the 1939 level; average hourly earnings in manufacturing, at 215 per cent; in comparison, wholesale prices were at 219 per cent, and retail prices at 176 per cent of the 1939 level.[1]

Corporate profits are up by a large proportion. In mid-1948 they were running at 408 per cent of 1939. But part of this is an illusion, for depreciation charges are now inadequately low because of continuing price inflation. And profits are in any case a small proportion of national income. If we took away all profits-after-taxes in 1948, prices *could* have fallen by only about 8 per cent. The "monopolistic," administered-price area in our economy, of steel, autos, chemicals, and the like, is precisely the area where prices have been held down most strongly below a free market price. Those who were able to buy at the low factory prices, could

[1]Disposable income, for the third quarter of 1948; other data for September, 1948.

promptly resell on the "grey" market at a higher price. Many a new car buyer in 1948 gained an easy $500 by driving his buy into a used-car lot down the street. Fear of public opinion, of union wage demands, and of the administrative cost of price changes may be explanations of this benevolent policy; but still there is the fact.

All this is a preface to policy. Our problem is: what should the Eighty-first Congress do? (1) There is always the possibility that the problem of inflation will end of itself. Farm prices fell considerably in 1948; buying eased off in many lines as postwar shortages were met. Refrigerators, washing machines, radios, and even cars were not as scarce as they once had been. Business investment for new equipment, plant, and for stocks of materials continued strong, but eventually it would taper off. With the continuation of European recovery and with a hoped-for lessening of international tension, the need for government expenditures would shrink.

But what if, unhappily, buying pressure continues strong and prices continue to edge upward? (2) There will then be strong public sentiment for price control. But price controls are not necessarily of much use. The likely first step is to protect consumers by imposing price ceilings on goods and services basically important in the standard of living. At the controlled, relatively low prices, more goods are demanded by consumers, and production of the goods may be discouraged. Hence the quantity demanded is now greater than the quantity supplied. Sellers find their shelves emptied as soon as they are stocked; warehouses are empty. The available supply goes to those who get to the store first, or who are favored by sellers. Consequently public sentiment soon swells for a system of rationing scarce goods in the interest of fair distribution. If the rationing system is well enforced, then incentives suffer. The real money is rationing tickets, and these are shared equally. Hence there is less incentive to earn more money-pay by working hard and working overtime. Also, with the prices of basic goods controlled and their quantities rationed, people now have money in pocket which they would otherwise have spent on the controlled goods. They are likely to spend most of this money on other, luxury goods. As prices soar upward in the uncontrolled areas, labor and other resources are attracted into production there, and the output of basic necessities lags further.

We are apt to demand next of our harassed public servants that price and rationing controls be extended over the whole of the economy. As

the complexity of the system grows, enforcement becomes increasingly difficult. Violations are hard to check because both buyer and seller often want to violate the law: the seller is glad to accept more than the legal price, the buyer is willing to offer more. We may have voted for controls on Tuesday, but on Wednesday we want that car and that steak. Illegal buying and selling—the so-called "black-market"—can spread until it becomes the main channel of trade. The laws grow increasingly unpopular and disregarded; enforcement grows spasmodic and ineffective.

These facts of price control have been demonstrated in many countries during the last several years. Where the controls are far out of line with supply-demand relations, there is little to choose between the evils of "repressed" inflation, and the evils of open inflation.

It is clear, from looking over these disagreeable but all too possible results of price and rationing controls, that a go-slow policy is in order. If inflationary pressure continues, a modest program of direct controls is desirable, or a stand-by program to be used only if price rises are rapid. But there remains the decided danger that the imposition of controls will simply lead to misuse of resources in uncontrolled luxury channels, and that black markets will appear and multiply. "There's no war on, you know"—so many of us will reason, and refuse the co-operation we gave up to V-J day.

(3) We have already seen one thing that should *not* be done. Taxes should not be reduced while inflationary pressure continues. Rather, higher taxes are desirable, to the extent that fairness permits, in channels where production will not be checked. (4) Still more important is the reduction of public expenditures by deferring or dropping all projects not urgently needed. A surplus of taxes over expenditures is a critically useful step toward checking inflation. In no serious inflation has such a budget surplus been achieved. If the investment boom continues, tax funds should be allowed to accumulate as an idle Treasury deposit in the Federal Reserve rather than be paid out to bond holders who would promptly reinvest in business channels.

(5) The encouragement of consumer saving is desirable. If strong inflationary pressure continues, it would be desirable to introduce limited compulsory savings. People would be required to buy government bonds, in amount equal to a proportion of their income tax. The bonds cannot

be cashed—except in hardship cases or unless a depression threatens—until three or four years in the future. Assuming that government and business expenditures absorb a constant share of output, compulsory savings would not reduce the quantity of goods and services people consume today. They can still buy the full employment output of consumer goods. The attempt to spend more money cannot get them more goods; it simply forces up prices. If their spending *now* is kept down, they will have savings to spend in the future, at a lower price level than otherwise and in a more stable economy.

(6) More drastic inflations than that of the United States have justified the recall of old currency and blocking of bank accounts, with a smaller quantity of new money issued in exchange. The Greek government at one time adopted the novel policy of selling imported goods to its people at black market prices, destroying the money so received.

(7) Last, and much more practicable for the United States, is a check on bank lending, lest other deflationary measures be offset by more creation of money by the banks. The problem is awkward since the Federal Reserve's responsibility toward maintaining reasonable stability in the prices of government securities makes it impossible at the present time to prevent expansion of bank lending. The mild tightening policies undertaken in 1948—raising the discount rate and required bank reserves—has mainly had the effect of causing banks to sell government securities to the Federal Reserve (despite the moderate decline permitted in the price of these securities). With the proceeds, bank reserves were increased to the required level, and banks could lend out to business investors as before. By some route, among several now suggested, the Federal Reserve must again get control of the money supply. This requires Congressional action.

There is always the danger that one or a group of the deflationary policies listed above will be carried too far, and transform an inflation into a cumulating recession. The problem of controlling inflation sometimes appears, as one economist phrased it, like trying to dim the light by pulling the light switch toward Off.

There is no painless way out of inflation. All the policies suggested above hurt someone. They check income or loans to people, or they increase taxes and savings to take funds away from people. The only practicable way to check serious inflation is through reducing demand, but

no one likes to have *his* demand reduced. Furthermore, demand must be reduced mainly among moderate-income groups: roughly six-sevenths of income goes to people with incomes under $10,000 a year. A still larger proportion of consumer spending is done by them. Politics, "the art of the possible," will certainly conflict, to a greater or less extent, with the measures that would satisfy economists.

HOUSING

By CHAT PATERSON

THE UGLY POLITICAL PHENOMENON known as the Eightieth Congress had a singular ability to walk straight up to a major problem and then calmly walk around it. In perhaps no field was this evasiveness more pronounced than in housing. It was the Eightieth Congress which, after receiving hundreds of pages of testimony from the Seventy-ninth Congress and thousands of desperate communications on the housing crisis throughout the country, established a "committee" to junket around the country and "look into" the problem.

The "problem" has been with us for the past half century. Although the returning veterans have been hardest hit by the lack of housing which they can afford to pay for, even before Pearl Harbor the shortage was severe. For fifty years, we have overbuilt for the upper income groups and underbuilt for the low income families. In addition to the acute veterans-housing crisis, millions of American citizens are living in sub-standard housing. About 3,000,000 families have been forced to double up with in-laws or relatives. America's vast slums house more than 5,000,000 families.

The sum total of rental or sale housing constructed during the past year was out of the financial reach of over half of the American people —that half which is most in need of housing relief. The public housing "trickle," according to Nathan Straus, former Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, has dried up, thanks to the Washington lobby of the slum landlords and the building and loan associations.

CHAT PATERSON has served the American Veterans Committee in a variety of capacities including National Chairman. He is now National Legislative Chairman and member of the National Planning Committee of AVC.

One might judge from reading the daily papers that everything possible is being done to meet the housing crisis. "We built *900,000* [italics mine—actually around 835,000] housing units in the United States last year," so goes the chant of the Real Estate Board defenders. But few point out that most of the houses built cost $8,000 or over. An $8,000 house requires a minimum income of $4,000 per annum. Also, the 835,000 dwellings constructed, even if half of the American people could afford to inhabit such dwellings, still scarcely cover the net increase in families during the same period, let alone make a dent in the pent-up housing demands.

The 1946 census figures on distribution of urban family income show clearly who should be the beneficiaries of an over-all housing program for America:

Annual Income	*Urban Families*	
	%	Millions
Under $750	4.6	1.0
$750 - $2,100	20.7	4.5
$2,100 - $3,600	35.3	7.7
$3,600 - $4,200	13.1	2.9
$4,200 and over	26.3	5.8
	100	21.9

Mr. Lee Johnson, the very capable executive vice-president of the National Public Housing Conference in Washington, in analyzing the relationship of the above figures to the nation's housing needs, stated:

> 1. Families with annual incomes below $750 are composed largely of old age couples and those otherwise incapacitated. The public housing subsidy is not adequate in itself to make decent housing available for this group, nor could these 1,000,000 families maintain themselves adequately without medical care, assistance grants, and other services.
>
> 2. The range for public housing falls largely between incomes of $750 and $2,100, or 20.7 per cent of urban families.
>
> 3. Families for whom practically no aids are available, even under the TEW Bill, are those with incomes of $2,100 to $3,600 or 35.3 per cent of all urban families. In an effort to make certain that public housing never will be in competition with private real estate interests, federal funds cannot be used to assist families in this bracket. With existing costs, private builders cannot produce decent shelter for rent or sale at monthly rates these families can afford. It is in this field that the most intensive research must be done.

4. For families having an income of $3,600 to $4,200 it is hoped that co-operatives, mutual ownership projects and "yield insurance" provisions of the TEW Bill which were adopted in the special session will offer some help.

5. For families with incomes of $4,200 and more, or 26.3 percent of all urban families, assistance is available through guarantees by the Federal Housing Administration. It was for this highest income group that the Eighth Congress legislated.

There is little to be gained by a recount of all the available gruesome data showing the predicament of America's ill-housed. Our attention must be focused on alleviating the situation through federal legislation.

The Eightieth Congress gave a large grunt about the housing crisis and produced the following in its special session of last summer:

1) Legislation providing additional incentives for private capital in the construction of low-cost housing. A builder now can secure a 90 per cent mortgage guarantee for every house that he constructs at less than $6,000; this means actually a $7,000 house. If the builder is constructing rental housing he can get a mortgage guarantee of 90 per cent on his investment on all units valued at $8,100 or less.

2) Legislation providing important incentives for the development of housing co-operatives. Any group of people can develop a co-operative and secure a mortgage guarantee of 95 per cent of its investment provided the co-operative is properly organized and shows evidence of sound business organization. But the Congress has enjoined the Federal Housing Administration from providing technical assistance to individuals in establishing housing co-operatives.

3) Legislation providing a guaranteed yield of between 2½ and 5 per cent for capital invested in housing. In time, this provision may bring more capital into the field and may be a factor in lowering housing costs.

The above three major provisions of the Housing Act of 1948, plus modified rent controls, constitute the housing record of the Eightieth Congress. The above represent the frills; the guts of a long-term housing program were eliminated (public housing for low income groups, slum clearance, an adequate research program and farm housing).

The November victories of liberalism throughout the nation showed that the American people, among other things, wanted public housing, slum clearance, and the other desirable features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill. The battle lines had been sharply drawn at the close of the special session when Speaker Joseph Martin (R.,

Mass.), Majority Leader Charles Halleck (R., Ind.), Rules Committee Chairman Leo Allen (R., Ill.), and the little man with the big stick from Michigan, the Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Jesse Wolcott, refused even to allow a vote on public housing, slum clearance, and farm housing in the House of Representatives.

By reverting to the iron-fist rule of the late Uncle Joe Cannon, Representative Wolcott managed to arouse the resentment of the American people toward the "gag" rule as it had not been aroused since Cannon's time. He and his gag-rule cronies made sure that housing would be the Number One issue on the agenda of the Eighty-first Congress. They presented the candidates for Congress, both Democrat and Republican, with a crucial issue which could make or break them in the elections. And it broke many.

The House Banking and Currency Committee (which has been the continual stumbling block for housing legislation passed by its Senate counterpart) will have a "new look" in the Eighty-first Congress. Four of the House committee's most persistent prattlers against public housing and for, what they called, the American Way (i.e. the Real Estate Lobby line) were told by their constituents that they weren't wanted any more —Frank L. Sundstrom (R., N.J.), Howard H. Buffett (R., Neb.), Parke M. Banta (R., Mo.), and Charles K. Fletcher (R., Cal.). Of the three Republican Committee members who voted for the T-E-W Bill in committee, two were re-elected (Merlin Hull, R., Wis., and Hardie Scott, R., Pa.). The third did not run for re-election.

Only three members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee came up for re-election. The two supporters of the T-E-W Bill (also since the Seventy-ninth Congress)—Burnet Maybank (D., S.C.), and John Sparkman (D., Ala.)—were re-elected. The third, C. Douglass Buck (R., Del.), spokesman for the DuPonts and violent opponent of the T-E-W Bill, suffered an unexpected defeat.

With control of the House Banking and Currency Committee passing to the competent Democratic hands of Brent Spence of Kentucky, Mike Monroney of Oklahoma, Frank Buchanan of Pennsylvania, Wright Patman of Texas, and Hale Boggs of Louisiana, there is no doubt but that the Eighty-first Congress will pass a comprehensive housing bill.

Should this be the T-E-W Bill? The T-E-W Bill was essentially a compromise proposal. For four successive sessions it was introduced and

reintroduced, amended, reamended, and during this period became the symbol or goal of those fighting for at least the attainable. Such measures as the Rabin and Taylor-Douglas bills, which advocated direct construction, could receive no general outside support for fear of "diverting" the efforts of those supporting the T-E-W Bill. The T-E-W Bill, however, represents only a fraction of the total needs as seen by such housing experts as Lee Johnson, Charles Abrams, Catharine Bauer, Nathan Straus, and others.

With the combined support of all the veterans organizations (by now the American Legion has become positively left-wing in its housing resolutions), church groups, citizens councils, private social agencies, and local and state government, a new long-range housing bill must be drafted, submitted to Congress, and passed. No more competent group of experts in this field could be found than those who together issued the report, "A Housing Program for Now and Later," through a joint committee of the National Public Housing Conference and the National Organization of Housing Officials. Catharine Bauer, in discussing this report in *The Nation* of May 15, 1948, cites the three goals for an effective national housing policy:

> Goal 1: Enough homes to overcome the present shortage, keep up with the increase in families, and replace the slums.
>
> Goal 2: New homes for all kinds of people—in all income groups, for rural as well as urban families.
>
> Goal 3: Good homes in good neighborhoods in pleasant and efficient communities.

Twenty million dwelling units must be produced by 1960—1,500,000 a year. This means doubling the current rate of building.

As Catharine Bauer said further in discussing the joint committee's report,

> Solely from the viewpoint of productive capacity, strong measures may be necessary if the shortage is to be met in three years: allocation of scarce materials, cutting down of non-essential construction, getting rid of restrictive practices all along the line, expansion in steel and other basic industries. But the first essential is "a firm bi-partisan Congressional determination to achieve a rate of 1,500,000 dwellings per year as quickly as possible and maintain that rate for the next ten to fifteen years." Hit-or-miss measures will never do the job, simply because "most of the restrictive practices which have hamstrung the housing industry . . . reflect fears of over-expansion and underemployment, fears all too well grounded in the past. The heroic effort required to

solve the shortage by 1951 will . . . create the very instrument we need later on to replace slums and, incidentally, combat depression."

President Truman and a Democratic Congress have pledged themselves to this task. To do less would cause us to miss perhaps our last great chance to do it right for the first time.

ORGANIZED LABOR

By LEWIS COREY

ONE ELECTION MANDATE is clear: repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. As events shape up at this writing (December, 1948), that repeal is certain. The still unanswered question is this: will the Taft-Hartley repeal be accompanied by simple restoration of the Wagner Act or with modifications of this act through amendments or new legislation?

Most of organized labor seems to want a simple restoration of the Wagner Act. This feeling is strongest in the CIO; the AFL is not so sure, because it claims that certain provisions of the Wagner Act and its administration discriminated against the craft unions of the AFL by favoring the industrial unionism of the CIO.

Whatever the divisions in organized labor it is highly doubtful, however, that there will be a simple restoration of the Wagner Act. The negative attitude of some union spokesmen, that they want no labor legislation at all, is neither good labor sense nor good public relations. For organized labor, as it includes a growing majority of wage-workers, is definitely affected with a public interest, and so subject to regulation within the ironclad limits of union independence and freedom. The problem here is *what kind of regulation, by whom, and for what.*

In addition, there are some abuses by some labor unions that may call for legislation if labor does not itself abolish them. It is these abuses that reactionaries exploit to create support for their reactionary proposals against unions. Take, for example, the question of jurisdictional strikes. They have grown in number and they will continue to grow as technological progress changes old jobs and creates new jobs. Labor has been unable to discipline itself and to work out peaceful means for the settle-

---

LEWIS COREY is Associate Professor of Economics at Antioch College and has been an editor of *The Antioch Review.*

ment of jurisdictional disputes. Under compulsion of the Taft-Hartley law they have worked out some machinery. Can the unions do so without compulsion? It is highly desirable that they do, because if they do not the law will clamp down. Moreover, unions should adjust their disputes peacefully, because there is nothing that irritates and, in some cases, inflames the public more than jurisdictional strikes.

There is also the "anti-racketeering" law. The true kind of racketeering, which is limited to a very few union cases, is liable to handling under criminal law. But the "racketeering" (which is not quite that) of the kind that Dan Tobin's union indulges in, is not legitimate unionism and is indefensible. Here, again, the issue is whether union labor will itself do a job or whether it will inflame the public and give a chance for repressive legislation.

On the question of strikes that "affect the public welfare" the problem is one of making no restrictions on the freedom of labor to strike (a basic freedom) and of maintaining the public welfare. It seems to me that where there is good will a method can be found of handling the problem without repressive anti-union legislation.

One issue is important: there is need for repeal of all legislation that interferes with collective bargaining at the grassroots, labor-management level. Too much legislation means too much dependence on government; it not only limits the freedom of union and management, but as labor leaders increasingly recognize, it weakens labor's self-reliance and union independence.

Philip Murray, president of the CIO, has made an important suggestion: that union labor, management, and public representatives get together to frame desirable labor legislation *within the framework of acceptance of unionism and collective bargaining* as indispensable for a democratic setup in industry.

A decisive argument against the Taft-Hartley law is that it interrupted the peaceful development of unionism and collective bargaining and of the growing movement toward friendlier, more understanding and co-operative relations between unions and management. That has been part of the trend: a Republican victory would undoubtedly have made it worse. Hence Murray's suggestion is not only good sense and good democracy, it is one means of getting the kind of legislation which will be accepted because it is not one-sided and repressive.

Regulation, however, has definite limits. It cannot interfere with the freedom of industry or of labor. It should not try to freeze labor-management relations within too detailed legislation. Nor must there be the least iota of repression in labor legislation: it must always be borne in mind that totalitarian dictatorships, whether right or left, always begin with destruction of the independence and freedom of labor unions. The wrong kind of regulation, therefore, is not only an attack on union labor but an attack on the whole of liberal democracy and may set in motion forces for its destruction.

On other issues than labor legislation, it is clear, organized labor will speak up. It is strengthening its political organization, moving in to make its influence stronger in the organization of the Democratic Party. And it will use this influence for democratic purposes.

Organized labor will work for an all-inclusive social security act, including universal coverage, higher benefit payments and health insurance. It will work for an upward revision of the minimum wage under the wage-and-hour law. It will support civil rights legislation and an FEPC. Finally, on foreign policy, organized labor will intensify its support of the Marshall Plan, it will call for more union representation in the formulation and administration of American foreign policy, including measures to fight communism by fuller support of union and social-democratic forces in Europe and Asia.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

By WILLIAM G. CARLETON

WHAT SHOULD WE EXPECT of the Eighty-first Congress in foreign policy? In most areas of foreign policy, of course, it is the Executive and not Congress which must take the initiative. However, there are treaties to come before the Senate for ratification and there are important matters of legislation and appropriation in the foreign field for which the entire Congress primarily will be responsible. Moreover, there is not a single phase of our foreign policy that cannot be influenced by congressional study, investigation, suggestion, debate, and publicity.

WILLIAM G. CARLETON, a frequent contributor to these pages, is Professor of Political Science at the University of Florida.

It is likely that the bipartisan approach to foreign policy will be continued by the Eighty-first Congress. This means that the two major parties will continue to co-operate on economic and military measures to check Soviet aggression, on support of fundamental American policies in the United Nations, and on other basic matters. However, within the framework of our general bipartisan foreign policy there is room for some shift in emphasis. For instance, in contrast to American conservatives, American liberals are more alive to the wisdom of playing popular social politics abroad, of winning mass support, of keeping free of alliances with reactionary and neofascist forces, of making alliances with laborite and social democratic and socialist forces, of emphasizing nontotalitarianism and democracy rather than free enterprise capitalism, of positively building a social democratic world in the very measures we use to check communism. From the Eighty-first Congress, more liberal than the Eightieth, we may confidently expect more emphasis on the social democratic aspects of our foreign policy.

Marshall Plan aid, of course, will be continued to the participating countries. President Truman will probably ask for a supplementary appropriation further to carry out the objectives of the plan, and Congress will probably comply with the President's request. Congress will also probe charges that there is profiteering under the plan and that American corporations are taking advantage of it to bludgeon their way into control of certain European industries. We must not allow the Marshall Plan to be a disguise for the penetration of American big business into Europe or for the further cartelization of Europe's privately-owned big business.

The United States Senate will be asked to ratify a consultative pact between the United States and certain countries of Western Europe, which will bring the countries of the North Atlantic into closer peacetime co-operation than in any period of their history. The most important practical features of this agreement will not be set down in the treaty itself but will be the product of implementation. By subsequent agreements the United States probably will acquire bases in the Eastern Atlantic and on the European Continent, and further, the United States will undertake by elaborate lend-lease arrangements to supply the participating nations with much of the modern equipment of war.

There will be differences of opinion over what countries should be accepted in these arrangements, and Congress will have much to say on

this subject. No doubt Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg will be included. Denmark and, in spite of her dictatorship, Portugal will be included if any of their territories are to be used for American bases. The inclusion of Italy would be wise. Italy is a strategic country both because of the continuing threat of its Communist Party and because of its position bordering on the Soviet sphere. Moreover, its inclusion would relieve France of much anxiety. Spain, however, should be excluded unless matters of highest military strategy require bases in Spanish territory. Franco has nothing else to sell because in any event he is committed to an anticommunist stand. More important, Spain's inclusion would chill democratic elements everywhere and generally damage morale.

Within the next year the most critical decisions with respect to Western Germany are to be made, and Congress will probably debate the possible alternatives and influence decisions. Shall the Ruhr industries be returned to their original owners? Shall Britain and the United States encourage socialization of the Ruhr industries? Shall some degree of Allied control be retained over the Ruhr industries even after the withdrawal of the Allied armies of occupation? The crucial and most baffling question with respect to Europe is still how to prepare the West fully to resist Soviet aggression without at the same time restoring the Germans to a position of decisive power. With this in mind, shall the heavy industries of all Western Europe be merged and socialized? This would remove the danger of domination by privately-owned cartels, and it would make international control over their heavy industries more palatable to the Germans, because the Germans alone would not be singled out for control. It might also make for more rapid economic recovery and positively increase Western Europe's capacity to produce. But is public opinion, particularly in America, ready for so drastic a step?

The Eighty-first Congress will have to help answer some of the most cruelly perplexing questions a government has ever been called upon to answer: What Chinese groups, if any, should be given American economic and military aid, and how much aid, and under what conditional guarantees? Should we demand the complete abdication of Chiang Kai-shek's government and the substitution of an entirely new regime? Are there any social-democratic elements in China capable of forming an effective government which we can support? Apparently not, but a dili-

gent search must be made. These elements exist in Japan. They exist in Burma. They exist in India; indeed, Nehru himself represents these elements. Curiously enough, they once existed in China; Sun Yat-sen's original movement was essentially a social-democratic movement. But today in China the social-democratic elements seem to be reduced to a few ineffectual groups. To suggest another alternative, can the Chinese Communists be weaned away from the Soviet? There is a faintly perceptible trend toward nationalism in communist parties in many countries today, and in the long run, Chinese Communists may turn out nationalist. Moreover, any government that wins China will desperately need American economic assistance. But a policy of rapprochement with Chinese Communists represents a big gamble, and present American opinion would hardly tolerate taking such a gamble. Finally, can the Chiang Kai-shek government be reconstructed with what liberal and democratic and social democratic elements there are in China, and can sufficiently rigid controls be devised to guarantee that American money is actually used effectively to fight the Chinese Communists and to insure agrarian reform and the spread of urgently needed social services to the Chinese people?

Congress may investigate charges that the military is making too many decisions in the occupied countries without sufficient historical and political knowledge, and that the views of the Department of State are not sufficiently controlling. Inevitably this question will lead to a larger examination of our whole administrative organization in the field of foreign relations. The establishment of a unifying Cabinet secretariat necessarily will force greater co-ordination of the work of all departments which deal with foreign relations and provide closer liaison among all Cabinet officers who have responsibilities in that area. Some reorganization in the State Department itself will be in order and a way found to relieve the Secretary of State of some of his routine duties. At present our Secretary of State must preside over the department at Washington, devise over-all policy, decide a host of routine administrative matters, attend in person many foreign conferences, and be present at important meetings of the United Nations, particularly when the Assembly is in session. This is too much for any one man. Legislation reorganizing administrative agencies which deal with foreign policy is squarely within

the duties of the Congress, and in this area the Eighty-first Congress will have a real chance to demonstrate constructive achievement.

Numerous other enactments and recommendations will come out of the Eighty-first Congress. Legislation empowering the Executive to make reciprocal trade agreements, extended for only one year by the old Republican Congress, will be renewed and probably extended for the usual three-year period. Additional credits will be voted Latin-American countries and the question of whether we ought to be politically agnostic in this matter or to discriminate in favor of genuinely democratic governments will have to be thrashed out again. And then there are many questions the Congress will want to ask the Executive. Has everything humanly possible been done to strengthen the United Nations and to win international acceptance of the American plan for the international control of atomic energy? Why have not the nations yet agreed upon so sensible and so humane a measure as the proposed genocide convention? Now that Israel is assured independence as a sovereign state, what has been done to cushion Arabic sensibilities? Are we alienating Nehru's India, an important ideological pivot in Asia, by a too pro-Pakistan position in the United Nations? These and a host of other questions will be asked and debated by the next Congress. For today, the American Congress cannot escape its share of responsibility for helping find wise solutions to the relentlessly continuing, the complexly interconnected, and the vastly far-reaching problems which beset the American government, the leading government of the non-Soviet world.

WESTERN CONSERVATION

By RUFUS TERRAL

PLUNDER AND WASTE of the natural riches of the country are being meditated along a more farflung front today than in the time, nearly half a century ago, when Theodore Roosevelt said in no small voice that they would not be tolerated. It will be a first job of the Eighty-first Congress to repeat to the exploiters, in terms which even they cannot continue to mistake, some pertinent remarks of that President concerning the

---

RUFUS TERRAL is an editorial writer on the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. In 1947 he published *The Missouri Valley: Land of Drouth, Flood, and Promise*.

welfare of the commonwealth. To that greater welfare, "when necessary, the private right must yield. . . ."

Today the private right, and often no better than the private greed, is being asserted on such a gigantic scale that the whole of the Missouri Valley—one-seventh of the nation—is involved, and 20 million acres of western range, and forests in Wyoming and Alaska, and the ocean floor under the shallow seas that rim the continent. Sometimes it is asserted by corporations avid for privilege, sometimes even by departments of government avid for power. But always it is asserted against the "welfare of the commonwealth."

Could a Congress ask for a bigger or more worthy job than that of striking the hands of the predatory profit-seeker and the predatory office-holder from the riches that belong to all people? This may seem to be a negative opportunity, a call merely to prevent wrongs from being done, but it is nothing of the sort. It is not only an opportunity for affirmative action, but thrillingly so. In no respect is it more an occasion for a positive and excitingly promising program of action than in the Missouri Valley.

In this vast region ranging from Missouri to Montana and from Iowa to Colorado, there is need of a program of regional development. Its floods should be controlled, and its drouths alleviated by irrigation works. Along with these objectives should go the development of soil, and forests, power, and navigation, water supply, sewage disposal, and the protection of fish and wildlife—all of them important to the present and the future of the valley.

An abortive version of such a program is now being attempted, in an abortive way, resulting in waste on an almost incredibly colossal scale. Instead of being based on a single plan in which every element has been given its proper place, it is based on two rival and conflicting plans—of the Army Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau—which have been put together with chewing gum and baling wire. Instead of being run by a single management, it is being run by the same dual and conflicting managements—Army and Reclamation—with such ridiculous and tragic possibilities that in the event these overlapping managers differed as to what to do about a flood that was raging down the river, the decision would have to be made in the ripeness of time by the Supreme Court!

By their own acknowledgments, these co-bunglers have jointly agreed to what in their individual judgments are a waste of $300 million of the

taxpayers' money—and this on the original estimate that the whole project would cost less than $2 billion. The estimate of total cost has now been increased to $10 billion, with goodness knows how much increase in waste.

If the present monstrosity is allowed to go on, purely for the sake of keeping the Army Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau in jobs, the consequences may be ruinous to the whole nation. The work which has been started may never be finished, as W. G. Sloan, author of the Reclamation Bureau's part of the joint "plan," has himself pointed out. "The . . . plans . . . are probably much more ambitious than can be realized. . . . The practicability of such a program may be questioned by many," said a report prepared under his direction. But no one connected with the "plan" has suggested cutting out the waste in order to make the money go as far as possible. Even if the "plan" were completed, it is based on an assumption of almost twice as much water as there is in the Missouri River System, so that a considerable part of these exorbitantly costly works would go to waste. And above and beyond all that, the hostilities which have stood between Army and Reclamation all these years would haunt the operation of these works forever.

A bill for a Missouri Valley Authority, which would evolve a single coherent plan for this development and carry it out under a single management, has been pending in Congress for four years. It has never received an intelligent hearing. Two committees went through the motions of holding hearings on it three years ago, but the lack of genuineness in these performances was evident in the fact that the late Senator Overton of Louisiana, an Army Engineer partisan who knew nothing about the argument for a Missouri Valley Authority and wasn't interested in finding out, was chairman of both hearings.

Neither has Congress made any genuine effort to ascertain what the people of the valley want. Instead, it has taken the word of the lobbyists for the power companies, the railroads, the building contractors and the barge lines, all of whom have personal reasons for distorting the facts. Senator Murray of Montana, author of the MVA bill, held hearings last year in a limited way, at his own expense, but Congress still owes it to the 8,000,000 people of the region to find out what they want instead of taking the word of hired propagandists for it.

The prospects for MVA legislation are the brightest they have ever been. The roster of its friends in Congress has been enhanced by several of the most brilliant new members of the Senate, men whose ability as vote-getters, as shown in the November elections, will gain them an exceptionally respectful hearing. There is Senator-elect Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, who has announced that he will fight for MVA. Senator-elect Paul Douglas of Illinois has said privately that he will do likewise. There is no question where Senator-elect Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, come up from the House of Representatives, stands; he has been one of the warmest and most effective friends of the Tennessee Valley Authority over the years. Behind such men, at the grassroots, are such organizations as the American Federation of Labor, which has made MVA a major legislative target for 1949; and the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the National Farmers' Union, both of which are actively in the fight for MVA. With that quality of leadership and support, it ought to be possible to get Congress to listen to reason. And from their frantic efforts for three years to prevent a fair hearing, the foes of MVA seem no more dubious than its friends as to where the weight of reason lies.

Another kind of greed than the bureaucratic is involved in still another major case involving the nation's resources which the new Congress will be called on to decide. This is the so-called tidelands oil, more accurately underseas oil. It lies beneath the ocean floor of the shelf that borders the continent to the point at which the submerged terrain plunges into the grand canyons of the sea. Within this undersea zone there is estimated to be a reserve of oil five times as great as all the rest of the oil reserves in the continental United States. This oil is absolutely essential to the ability of the nation to fight another war if need be. Since it is the federal government rather than the state governments that is responsible for the fighting if war comes, the federal government requires control of the underseas oil continuously, to make sure that in event of a national emergency enough will be left to meet the requirements. The state governments have no such responsibility for national defense or for maintaining sufficient oil reserves to fulfill that high purpose. Yet the states of California, Texas, and Louisiana, off which principally the underseas oil is believed to lie, want control of this national resource. They want it for no better reason than that the oil companies are willing to

pay millions of dollars for leases to exploit the reserves. The companies want the leases for no better reason than that they are profitable. Both the companies and the three underseas-oil states are parading their claims under the banner of state's rights—regardless of the rights of the forty-five other states which also look to this oil for the defense of the nation of which they are a part.

Bills to quitclaim the federal rights to underseas oil have been introduced in Congress in the past several years and seem likely to be introduced again in the Eighty-first. The Supreme Court, which has already ruled for the federal government in the case of California, and which may be asked for another ruling in the dissimilar case of Texas, may be the eventual arbiter of this dispute. But the oil plunderers, and the various false fronts behind which they are at work, are overlooking no chances to get Congress to give away the nation's birthright. The Eighty-first Congress should be equally alert to do nothing of the kind.

In the West and Pacific Northwest there are still others who do not believe that the country still means what Theodore Roosevelt meant when he said that the private interest must bow to the interest of the commonwealth. In the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses repeated efforts have been made to throw open valuable public lands to private exploitation. The most ambitious of these is the proposal to sell 20 million acres of western range at a nominal price to cattle and sheep men who now have permits to graze on them. This barefaced fraud, which the *Denver Post* calls "the most colossal landgrab ever attempted in American history," is still an open chapter. Bernard De Voto, writing in *Harper's,* has done more than any other single American to expose and oppose it. Sometimes the land-grabbers have attacked directly and sometimes indirectly by seeking to cripple the Forest Service, which administers the grazing permits. The Eighty-first Congress can do much to discourage them by seeing that the Forest Service is provided with ample funds to do its work.

A grab of the same sort, but for lumber instead of range, is a continuing piece of business in the Olympic National Forest, in Washington, and the Tongass National Forest, in Alaska. The proposal regarding Olympic is a crassly frank one to permit lumbering operations in 56,000 acres. This would be the first step toward cutting off the magnificent Douglas fir and Sitka pine from 300,000 acres, or one-third of this virgin forest. In Alaska the tactic is oblique. Veterans would be permitted to

acquire as much as three square miles each of the Tongass Forest. What happens when forest lands are given to veterans as bonuses was demonstrated amply after the Civil and Mexican wars. Veterans were used as fronts by lumber companies which bought up huge tracts for next to nothing and exploited them ruthlessly. This process would be inevitable in Alaska, because veterans would not be able to make any use of the forest lands themselves. It would be all the more destructive because so much of Alaska's future depends on the proper use of the natural resources of the Tongass forest.

Here is a job of conservation cut out for the Eighty-first Congress. It is enough to make membership in that body a challenging and absorbing occupation for any Senator or Representative bent on serving his country by saving it.

CIVIL LIBERTIES *in a* FAVORABLE CLIMATE

By WALTER WHITE

THE CLIMATE of American public opinion on civil and human rights has never been so hopeful of results as it is today. One of the clearest indications of this change is a negative one—the frantic efforts of organizations like the Ku Klux Klan to check the tide. Another is the eagerness by the non-Klan South to build up a record of convictions of white men charged with rape of Negro women as a basis for claiming that federal legislation is not needed since the South is doing the job itself.

The affirmative factors are numerous. One of the most potent is the constant barrage of attacks on the United States at the United Nations General Assembly in Paris by Soviet Russia and her allies, who charge that the United States is hypocritical in supporting human rights and genocide resolutions while lynching, disfranchisement, segregation, and economic and political discrimination against racial and religious minorities continue unchecked. Over and above these obviously political jibes is the awakening of the United States to the fact that its prestige among nonwhite peoples, who constitute two-thirds of the world's people, as well as among many whites, has been shrinking steadily for many gen-

---

WALTER WHITE is Secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

erations because of the perpetuation of such flagrant evils in the United States. Recently, in Germany, my questions about the naïveté of an educated people accepting Hitler's racist theories were tartly and promptly answered by comments on segregation in the American army of occupation in Germany and the anti-Semitism among American soldiers, and especially among American officers.

But the chief ingredient in creating this national concern about civil rights is the courage which was demonstrated on this issue by President Truman. When representatives of church, labor and minority groups, in 1946, presented to the President the grim facts about the alarming rise of mob violence and racist propaganda, Mr. Truman, unlike any of his predecessors, promptly agreed to tackle the issue without equivocation. As we were leaving, after decision had been made to create the President's Committee on Civil Rights, I warned him that the reactionary elements in the South and some in the North would attack him. He replied quietly, "If my political career has to be sacrificed to stop outrages like these, so be it."

The forthright report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights has been purchased by more than one million Americans. Thousands of editorials, pro and con, have been written about it. Many thousands of mass meetings have discussed its findings, most of them endorsing it. Thousands of study groups of student, labor, church, minority, and other organizations have analyzed its findings.

The report of the President's Committee has been followed by the unequivocal endorsement of it and with additional plans to eliminate racial segregation in the church by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and other church groups. Labor organizations, like the CIO, have endorsed it *in toto* while parts of its program, such as the FEPC, have been endorsed by the AFL and several independent unions.

It is now generally agreed that President Truman's re-election was in large measure due to his having taken an unequivocal stand on this issue. The crushing defeat given the Dixiecrats and the demonstration that a President can be elected without the Solid South has caused a most becoming humility, which it is hoped will be lasting, among the southern race-baiters. Time-serving politicians in the Congress have begun to wake up to the fact that their political futures rest upon taking a more honest and forthright stand on this issue.

But this gratifying change of atmosphere is not self-implementing. It is already evident that conservative southern Democrats and northern Republicans intend to continue their coalition of opposition to civil rights and related legislation, such as housing, social security, equitable tax laws, and labor legislation. Every delaying device, such as the filibuster, will again be used to prevent enactment of an FEPC bill and, if possible, of antipoll tax and antilynching bills. To prevent this, two vitally important steps need to be taken at the inception of the Eighty-first Congress. The first of these is amendment of the Senate rules to provide for the imposition of cloture by a majority instead of by the present two-thirds vote. Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon has announced that he will move for this change, and President Truman has pledged Democratic support. Southern filibusterers have threatened to stage the longest filibuster in senatorial history against such a proposed change. But those who are determined that the disgrace of filibusters be ended are united in believing that it would be advantageous to have the issue fought out on this point. Success of the filibuster depends almost entirely upon whether or not northern Senators, especially conservative Republican ones, give open or covert support to it.

The second important issue is the composition of Senate and House committees, particularly of the House Rules Committee. There is strong sentiment in Washington and throughout the country for abandonment or drastic amendment of the archaic seniority rule of the Congress, which gives control of congressional committees on the basis of how long Senators and Congressmen have been able to escape defeat. Many of those who will chair important committees, unless the seniority rule is amended are senile or close to senility, or come from the Deep South where they have remained in office for decades because both whites and Negroes are disfranchised, or both. Much of the legislation for which the voters of America cast their ballots on November 2 will be defeated unless there is a change in the House and Senate rules.

Once decision has been made on the rules, the passage of the following bills can be hoped for in the Eighty-first Congress: (1) a federal Fair Employment Practices Bill, (2) an antilynching bill, (3) an antipoll tax bill, (4) a bill to abolish segregation in the armed services, (5) a civil rights bill for the District of Columbia and other federal territories, the

need for which has been dramatically and devastatingly exposed by the report of the Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital.

There are numerous tangential bills dealing with housing, minimum wages, the rights of labor—including repeal or drastic modification of the Taft-Hartley Act—expansion of social security, an equitable tax bill which will not victimize Americans of low or moderate income and give benefits to the wealthy.

But none of these civil rights or other bills will be passed unless there is an alert, informed, and organized public opinion determined to see the job done for which American voters cast their ballots on November 2.

CIVIL LIBERTIES —A DEMOCRATIC VICTORY

By HEINZ EULAU

If ever a Congress of the United States had the opportunity to make good the pledges of its majority, it lay in the hands of the Republican-controlled Eightieth to break new ground in the field of human rights. But if ever a Congress muffed its chance, the Eightieth muffed it. It failed to abolish the poll tax, to enact antilynching legislation, and to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission—all of them promised in the Republican Party's 1944 platform. Worse, by letting the so-called Committee on Un-American Activities run amok without the slightest resistance from its responsible leaders, the late Republican Congress wrote a dark chapter in the annals of America's fight for freedom.

It may be unkind to gloat over the Republicans' lack of foresight and statesmanship after the drubbing they received at the polls last November. But it is not altogether conjectural to say that their do-nothing policy on the issue of civil rights, coupled with the demagogic antics of the Thomas Committee, contributed to the Republican fiasco. But in the blind zeal of the Republican leadership to put every conceivable obstacle in the path of President Truman's reputation and re-election chances, they forgot that civil rights legislation might be vital to their own success in a campaign year.

Heinz Eulau is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Antioch College. Previously he was Assistant Editor of *The New Republic*.

Republican misjudgment of popular sentiment on civil liberties brings out in sharp relief the commitments of the new Democratic Congress. These commitments were first recognized by the group of liberal insurgents at the Democratic convention who insisted on the inclusion of a clear-cut civil rights plank in the party's platform. Led by the New Deal-minded Americans for Democratic Action, they rejected the pussyfooting compromise formula proposed by the party bigwigs and seemingly acceptable even to President Truman himself. Their victory on the floor of the convention heralded a new beginning in the Democratic Party's position on civil rights. It meant that the liberals in the party would no longer let themselves be intimidated by the buffooneries of the Southern wing, and that they were willing, if necessary, to break with Southern reaction. The subsequent secession of the Dixiecrats, the reelection of President Truman without the support of the solid South, and their own good showing in the elections has vindicated the belief of these liberals that the Democratic Party's survival depended on a wholehearted stand on civil liberties.

Cynics may say that this is a romantic version of what transpired at the Democratic convention, and that the civil rights plank was merely a desperate move to goad deluded minorities into the Democratic fold. But such cynicism only betrays its own sense of frustration. Meanwhile, it serves the dubious purpose of befuddling a proper evaluation of what the Democratic victory last November really meant. The heart of the matter is that, by making a full-fledged civil rights program a major campaign issue for the first time in American history, the Democrats challenged the party of Abraham Lincoln on its home ground. The Republican convention was satisfied with adopting a mild compromise plank which did not occasion even a whisper of controversy on the floor. The Democrats, on the other hand, in the most raucous session of their convention, declared their readiness to be judged on the record of making good their stand in favor of racial equality. It seems worthwhile in this connection to contrast the expectations of the cynics with those of the usually cautious American Civil Liberties Union which has stated, in its otherwise gloomy 1948 report, that "prospects for favorable Congressional action, despite Southern filibusters, are more favorable than in years."

The task before the new Democratic Congress is clear and should be measured by performance. But before it is legitimate to pass judgment,

it is necessary to have proper criteria by which to judge. While the Eighty-first Congress may not completely accomplish what the Democratic platform promises, there is sufficient ground to expect that it will make genuine efforts to enact some long overdue civil rights laws—efforts which its predecessor did not even try to make. Indeed, *the degree of these efforts* will be a more reliable index of Democratic sincerity than any arbitrary, predetermined standard of desirable achievement. Yet, if caution is warranted lest false optimism lead to disillusionment when judgment day arrives two years hence, a prognosis of Congressional behavior cannot be anything but hopeful.

High on the agenda of the civil rights program are the antipoll tax, antilynching and FEPC measures. There should be little difficulty in passing them in the House of Representatives. The House has acted favorably on similar legislation in the past. But the Senate is another story again. In the past it has been a veritable cemetery of civil rights bills. Undoubtedly, the southern Senators will try to prevent the consideration of civil rights measures as well as letting them come to a vote. But it is well to remember that the notorious wartime filibusters against the antipoll tax bill and the eighteen-day filibuster in 1946 against FEPC would probably have been unsuccessful had the Southern Democrats not received tacit aid from many Republican Senators.

If Southern intransigence can be broken, the struggle for equal rights will gain momentum, but it is by no means won. The impediments in the way of civil rights legislation are many and great. The legislative process itself is slow and cumbersome. Not too much help can be expected from the Senate Judiciary Committee which is headed by Senator Pat McCarran, of Nevada, who has not distinguished himself in the past as an ardent supporter of civil rights. Different parts of the program have encountered and will encounter different degrees of resistance. Such resistance raises questions of timing, priority, and compromise. Should the program be pushed as a package or piecemeal? In case of the latter, should one part, antilynching legislation for instance, be temporarily sacrificed in exchange for a quick antipoll tax bill?

There are serious and reasonable doubts, even among liberals, as to the constitutionality of some of the proposed measures. The President's Committee on Civil Rights admitted that several are frankly controversial, but pointed out that there are enough specific constitutional bases to

serve as encouraging guides to legislative action. Finally, no civil rights program can be expected to be successful without an accompanying educational campaign which must overcome some of the most deep-rooted prejudices of the American people, both in the North and the South.

On the asset side of the ledger, intangible perhaps, but nevertheless crucial, is the change in the political climate of opinion which has followed the Democratic victory since November. Comparison of the grim picture of the national state of civil liberties before the elections with the present situation suggests that in the atmosphere poisoned by the irresponsible histrionics of the Un-American Activities Commitee civil rights legislation had little chance indeed. Never before had a congressional investigatory committee sunk so low as the Thomas Committee—with its badgering of witnesses, its smearing of government employees, its irrelevant questioning, its disregard of basic constitutional guarantees. It created fear not warranted by the facts; it produced popular confusion and uncertainty over the meaning of civil liberties; it forced a reluctant and insecure administration into undertaking an exaggerated and futile loyalty check of its employees—for no other reason, it seems in retrospect, than to head off congressional action which would probably have been even more unfair; and it discredited Congress itself as a vital instrument of a democratic polity.

The defeat of two of its Republican members in the elections and the indictment of Chairman Thomas for misuse of funds have discredited the Un-American Activities Committee even in the eyes of more conservative Congressmen. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, is known to have little sympathy for the type of work done by the committee. After ten years of existence, its publicity-seeking members have turned out a single piece of legislation, the constitutionally and politically dubious Mundt-Nixon Bill. If outright abolition of the committee proves impossible, liberal Congressmen are resolved to staff it with members who can be counted on to have greater respect for the constitutional guarantees of the Bill of Rights, or even to turn it into a committee whose chief purpose would be the *protection* of civil liberties. The exclusion of Dixiecrat John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, from the committee would go a long way to appease those who have no use at all for this kind of congressional activity, and who believe that saving the country from subversive influences is the proper function of administrative agencies.

In defeating the Republican Party and once more turning to the Democrats, the American people have indicated that the President's Committee on Civil Rights came close to the truth when it concluded its report with the reminder that "the future of our nation rests upon the character, the vision, the high principle of our people. Democracy, brotherhood, human rights—these are practical expressions of the eternal worth of every child of God."

FULL EMPLOYMENT: A PROPOSAL

By JAMES G. PATTON

THE FIRST QUESTION that comes up whenever we discuss the National Farmers Union's proposed "Full Employment Act of 1950" is, why did you put it forward now? Usually the inquirer implies that in a time of virtually full employment and of great prosperity for at least large elements of the population, it will be impossible to obtain serious consideration in Congress for any program to avert further depressions. Coupled with this question of political feasibility, of course, goes the other question whether we have not already solved the problem of boom-and-bust.

So far as the immediate prospect that Congress will authorize the $15 billion capital investment fund proposed in the bill is concerned, the title of the legislation itself is a clue to the answer. We have called this suggested law an "Act of 1950" deliberately in the effort to emphasize that we expect in putting it forward not that it necessarily will be adopted at once but that we expect to continue to press for its adoption or the adoption of something like it for as long as may be necessary.

How much progress can be made in the new Congress is wrapped in mystery. However, the new Congress clearly will contain a greater number of individuals of inquiring intellect and open mind than have been seen in the Senate and the House of Representatives for some years, and we feel sure that some of them will push such a proposal as this. Moreover, Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, may head the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and the senator long has understood the need for public action to prevent slowdowns of economic activity.

The result cannot but be beneficial, for the conduct of a searching inquiry into the cause of cyclical economic depressions will lead ultimately to the taking of steps to end them. We hope to get that much, as a minimum, accomplished in the Eighty-first Congress.

JAMES G. PATTON is president of the National Farmers Union.

Which brings me to the second of the questions: have we already reached a plateau of permanent prosperity? When the question is put boldly like that, most of the questioners themselves begin to have doubts. Nevertheless, an increasing number of leaders, especially in business circles, are beginning to act as if they believe, as many of them did in 1928 and 1929, that simple abstention by government from any interference with inflation, with the trend toward concentration of economic control in a few corporations, with the regional imbalance that marks our economy, will lead on and on down a rose-embowered path forever dedicated to increasingly larger profits and no worries whatever.

Such a psychology is dangerous in the extreme, for even a superficial look at the props under our present high-level employment and production economy shows that they are feeble. Primarily, these props consist of three elements: vast military expenditures, subsidized exports to the tune of billions annually, and the still unsatisfied volume of consumer demand built up during the war. The third of these in turn depends to a considerable extent upon the two former. In other words if the governmental budget were cut back to normal peacetime expenditures, then we would be faced with an immediate decline in employment that would make it impossible for millions of people to satisfy their needs, just as inflation is reducing that ability now. Yet, both the heavy military expenditures and the large sums being spent for assistance to other countries are at the mercy annually of the appropriations committees of House and Senate. There are of course innumerable other factors intertwined with these three. There is still a relatively high level of purchasing power that has withstood in some groups the ravages of inflation. There are the ever-mounting corporate profits. And there is the venturesome spirit induced in many businessmen by successive years of prosperity. But all of these could crumble rapidly if the three principal props I have mentioned earlier should collapse.

* * *

As a matter of fact, almost no economist is willing to hazard the view that we have ended economic fluctuations. On the contrary, nearly all of them are firmly convinced that there are elements of serious danger in our present condition, that it is only a matter of time before activity slows down seriously, and that the next depression will be an extremely acute one, in the nature of a crisis for the free-enterprise system. We

believe that, even if the machinery is not already set up for dealing with such a crisis when it arrives, the more discussion that has preceded its arrival, the more quickly the nation can act to do something about it. Ideally, of course, the way to deal with economic disease is preferably the same as dealing with physical diseases, that is, preventive steps are always much better than curing the patient if he has become ill. We should like very much, therefore, to see a "floor" put under the economy now rather than after conditions have become aggravated. But even if our proposal leads only to hearings and discussion, we are convinced that the time and energy we have put into it will have been well expended.

What we have proposed is, very briefly, simply to provide the President with an executive arm to carry out for him the findings of his policy and advisory arm, the National Council of Economic Advisors. The governmental mechanics of the proposal is very simple. It calls for the conversion of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation into the Directing Board to execute the policies proposed by the Council of Economic Advisors and approved by the President. The new RFC would be a very different type of body from the present. The proposed bill would call for the appointment of seven directors, each of whom would receive a salary of $25,000 per year. It describes their function as follows:

"The principal function of the board of directors shall be to assist, through management of the Capital Development Fund described later herein, in the achievement of the long-range program of production, employment and investment goals set forth in the Economic Report."

It would be our hope that adoption of such legislation as this also would strengthen the Council of Economic Advisors and encourage it to move more rapidly towards the establishment of the long-range goals mentioned in the proposed law. The council has performed admirably in its brief period of existence. Already, with the expenditure of very little money, it has begun to move toward the establishment of such goals. With the assistance of an agency formally dedicated to putting its policies into execution, the council could be expected to become an even more significant and vital agency for the economic well-being of the country.

Further to insure that the new RFC would move vigorously toward the achievement of such goals, the suggested legislation calls for the

establishment of a Capital Development Advisory Board composed of 12 members, of whom three each are to represent labor, agriculture, industry and the general public interest. The advisory board would be subject to confirmation by the Senate and thus would be modeled closely upon the advisory board to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which performed such yeoman service during the war.

Title II of the measure would place at the disposal of the board of the RFC a $15 billion revolving fund with which it would "actively seek to maintain levels of production, employment, and investment called for in the Economic Report through the making of loans to private business, and to public and private agencies, on such terms and under such conditions as in its judgment will promote the attainment of those objectives."

In ordinary times, the RFC tends simply to service previous loans and even in periods of emergency it has not regarded it as part of its responsibility to seek actively to find borrowers or to promote new enterprises. It is our conception that the new RFC would act aggressively to find means of achieving, through the making of loans, the goals set by the Council of Economic Advisors. This would mean not only screening and supervision of the enterprises to which loans were made, but a vigorous search for the right individuals or groups, the right locations, and the right kinds of enterprises to serve the general welfare.

Finally, the RFC would be authorized, if this bill should become law, to make four types of loans. First, it would make loans to existing private business enterprises if those enterprises contributed to the achievement of the goals laid down by the council. Next, if it proved impossible to make such loans to present enterprises, then it would "encourage the formation of new business enterprises through which the purposes of this act may be achieved." Third, if it finds it impossible to make such loans to new or old private enterprises then it will turn to the state governments and make available to them on its own terms and conditions the funds needed to promote industrialization, where that fits into the long-range pattern worked out by the council.

A final category of loan suggested in the bill is to such regional authorities as the Tennessee Valley Authority "for the purposes of complementing regional programs of private and state investment through the construction of facilities and promotion of enterprises affected with a general public interest." A proviso attached to this clause seeks to make

a little more clear the purpose for which these loans may be made. The proviso says, "such enterprises may include basic industrial operations essential to other manufacturing and business operations, as well as such public works as dams, hydro-electric facilities, etc."

Of special interest to political scientists and those interested generally in government, it seems to me, is the third type of loan mentioned above, that is the loan by an arm of the national government to state governments in order to enable them to achieve appropriate industrialization. To me, this appears to be only a sensible and logical extension of the original federal system envisioned by the founding fathers of the nation. In our day, political frameworks often have proved less important than economic frameworks. Thus, the preservation of the federal system by projecting it into economic affairs would seem to be wholly desirable.

II

At the outset of this article, I have mentioned and attempted to answer two of the questions frequently asked us about the "Full Employment Act of 1950." Those questions had to do with the political climate and the over-all economic necessity for such a proposal as this.

In addition, however, there are other aspects of the matter which worry a good many people who are interested in these problems. I am referring now to those economists and leaders in public life who are skeptical of the ultimate benefits of attempting to resolve our dilemma by using the investment method.

To them, I should like to say first of all that we do not regard this bill or the provision of an adequate supply annually of investment funds as by any means the total or sole solution. This bill is not intended as a panacea. It will not cure all economic ills nor is it to be regarded as a substitute for such desirable social measures as expanded social security, comprehensive public housing programs, national health insurance, the assurance of an adequate diet to all Americans, a satisfactory minimum wage, conservation and price support programs, or even the control of inflation. All of these and many other advances in the economic and social field still must be made.

Above all, this bill is no substitute for the mass buying power which is so essential to the full functioning of the American economy nor is it a substitute for the provision of an adequate shelf of needed public works,

blueprints and all, upon which we may draw readily and swiftly in time of emergency. As to the former, it would naturally be our hope that a continuous flow of funds into new enterprises and an improved regional distribution of those enterprises would assist materially in maintaining purchasing power. Indeed, we would expect it to have a highly beneficial effect in that it should make it possible to increase buying power in those regions where it is lowest.

Perhaps the most prevalent misconception of the bill which we have encountered has been that it is simply another way of providing funds from the Treasury for public works of the orthodox type. The bill is almost the obverse of such an approach. It is designed to provide a flow of investment funds into industrial and business enterprises at the level required to maintain employment and directed toward those areas most in need of industrialization and additional employment opportunities.

This does not mean that adoption of this proposal would in any way interfere with large-scale governmental programs in addition if a future emergency should require that the government embark on such direct spending programs. The proposed loans to valley authorities, for instance, would be intended primarily to afford additional industries needed to bolster the private enterprise economy in such valley authority areas rather than to provide additional public spending for dams or for other works of that character.

In our view, both approaches are needed but up to this point we have seen no other proposal for placing back of a truly competitive system the power of the government to the same degree to which it has been proposed that it be exerted for the expansion of public works projects.

I have said earlier that we hope in putting forward the ideas outlined above to help to lead the way towards a solution of the historic dilemma of capitalism and of free enterprise, the recurrence of panics and economic crises. No greater service could be performed at that juncture in history than to evolve a workable method of doing just that, for the preservation of individual liberties may hinge upon it.

Is there a fundamental contradiction between security and freedom? Can bread and liberty be afforded by the same political and economic system? In my view, we must find the answer. I have no doubt whatever that the answer is in the affirmative, yet it is getting very late for us to spell out the mechanics of that affirmation.

It is quite true that this motive was the central motive in our proposal of the "Full Employment Act of 1950," just as it was four years ago when we suggested a previous full employment bill out of which evolved the employment act of 1946 and the establishment of the National Council of Economic Advisors. But there are two other reasons of transcendent importance, both of them closely interwoven with the problem of achieving permanent economic stability. Of these, one is obvious. This is the need for insuring the working of the capitalistic system in business and in industry. We have not thus far been able to slow down the progress toward consolidation of industry and, in fact, the impetus of the war and postwar periods has been in the other direction.

"If nothing is done to check the growth in concentration," the Federal Trade Commission has said recently, "either the giant corporations will take over the country or the government will be impelled to step in and impose some form of direct regulation in the public interest."

Either of these drastic alternatives is repugnant to the American temper, and we should search strenuously for a third alternative. The antitrust laws remain, in the words of Justice Holmes "a brooding omnipresence in the sky." Moreover, in recent months the Department of Justice has moved capably and aggressively toward their enforcement in many of the most important sectors of American industry. Nevertheless, the approach of the antitrust laws to the problem is a negative approach. They should be strengthened by a complementary positive approach toward the erection of strong competing enterprises in those fields where they are so badly needed.

Thus, it is our hope that the "Full Employment Act of 1950" or legislation growing out of it can afford the tools with which to perform the creative acts necessary to complement the antitrust laws.

The other of the reasons for urging action of this kind is that the United States lacks regional economic balance and the continued existence of this imbalance is a threat to stability. Many writers have emphasized the colonial status of the states outside the great northeastern industrial concentration. Most recently the situation was summed up in the excellent phrase used by Avrahm Mezerik as the title for his book, *The Revolt of the South and the West.* Many of the evils of such undue concentration have been stressed repeatedly, the existence of extremely low living levels in the dependent states, the exaction of artificial and unnecessary trans-

portation costs, the unnecessary separation of raw materials from factories, and the failure to use our productive power effectively.

But very few people have noted that such regional imbalance operates in much the same fashion as severe inequalities in income and purchasing power. In other words, the continuance of depressed areas in the South and the West even in times of prosperity operates as a drag upon the general economy, just as the continuance of too many jobs in the $1,200 a year category operates as a drag. Indeed, the two are pretty closely related as a comparison of average income by states will show at a glance.

Three years ago the late Senator Josiah Bailey of North Carolina proposed a bill for industrialization of underdeveloped areas that struck at this problem. It was a well conceived bill and one that should have been adopted. The National Farmers Union supported it strongly, even though it did not in itself contain the authorizations required to rectify conditions. Nevertheless, it provided the framework in which action could have been taken and was the first attempt in Congress to deal with one of the greatest of our national problems. With the work of the Council of Economic Advisors proceeding along the general lines on which it has begun, we are inclined to believe that a direct attack on the problem may become feasible, so far as legislation is concerned, at as early a date as did the adoption of such a bill of that of Senator Bailey. In any case, if such a measure as that which we are now proposing should become law, the new RFC board would have at its disposal the means for speeding up by decades the industrialization of those parts of our country that stand most in need of it.

Fundamentally, however, all of these factors stem from our feeling that sooner or later we are going to come face to face with decisions that will tax all our ingenuity and good will as a people. It will be up to us then to make the adjustments and to take the steps that will make us not only a secure people, but a free people. It is my hope that the "Full Employment Act of 1950," which we have put forward, may contribute to making those decisions the right ones when that time comes.

A STORY

MR. TODD

By HARRIS DOWNEY

SEE THAT MAN LOOK UP SHARP at the corner as if discovering he had passed his turning? He's looking for old Mr. Todd.

In that pause at the curb, in that turning about, he wonders: Was he supposed to meet someone? Has he forgotten something? *Now, let's see, I was going*—. He shakes his head and, doubtful still, goes on his way; for he did not know that he was looking for Mr. Todd, was expecting to see him there waiting for the street car or wielding his big umbrella like a stick as he jerked himself across the street. No. Down the next block, before he had come to the corner, he had seen a black umbrella angling among the maze of shopping bags and dresses; or, dreaming of something in his youth, he had been walking the gallery-shadowed Third Street of his memory, oblivious to the crowded buildings and the unfamiliar faces. And the figure of Mr. Todd had stirred from that heap of old perceptions that lie among memories as indifferently as leaves among tombs.

Istrouma has many such wonders—like ghosts. Its past flashes unexpectedly alive as youth often does from a face gnarled with age.

But this figure, somehow, is reversed; for, long ago, Istrouma was an old town with the slow precious ways of age and now, except for a few patches like saltlicks, it is hurried and new. People still say—and still visualize—"down by the Robertson house" or "across the lake," though the brick-columned house with its sweet olive trees has given way to the Heidelberg Hotel and the lake has been leveled into a site for those houses like boxes. In the unconscious measuring of your progress down Beauregard Walk you might intend cutting under the elms at Triangle Square so that, when you come to the place, you stare up at the towering Triad Building, feeling lost. For the old town and the new exist in the mind of the natives like double exposure, as confused and as contradictious.

HARRIS DOWNEY is Assistant Professor of English at Louisiana State University.

Old Mr. Todd was as familiar to the town as the Robertson house or the lake.

Eternally to walk about seemed to be a compulsion for all the town characters: Aunt Mitty, wrinkled and black as a prune, picking up tin foil and mumbling *The Colonel ain't come;* Billy Southunder, grinning at gaping boys who expected water to flow from the ears of his giant Mardi-Gras head; the Ferrystone "idiot," flapping his hands against his chest, lolling his head, cawing in the voice of the mute; and old Mr. Todd, thin and bent, dressed in black, shaking his umbrella at traffic and children.

Whenever you started downtown, you thought of course of what you would do there—or you might be thinking of anything under the sun—but always in your mind, not considered but yet there like money in your pocket or old ambitions in your dreams, there was the knowledge of Third Street. Long before you got there you could feel yourself glancing at the diamonds in Roumain's or going through the swinging doors of the five-and-ten. You would see yourself seeing Miss Margie in her little glass cage at the picture show, Mr. Altazin in his summer uniform directing traffic at the Laurel Street crossing, Mr. Blanchard leaning in the door of his Varsity Shop, or Aunt Mitty, stooping towards the curb, turning over something with her foot tied up in an old tennis shoe. And if you happened to think of Mr. Todd swinging his umbrella at some whistling kid, then—just as you're compelled to go back and scrape the picket you missed in the fence—you would have to steer yourself across the street before you let the vision go; for you never liked to pass close to him. He might hit you over the head. Besides, your own urge to whistle would be so strong that you'd never trust yourself.

And even if you missed seeing one or the other—the stuffed bobcat in the window of Beasley's Hardware or Benny Ferrystone beating his chest—you would *think* you had seen them. You would *always* have sworn: "I saw old Todd downtown today."

It would please Mr. Todd to know that he had bewildered the man looking up sharp at the corner; for Mr. Todd was as hateful as envy. Too, he was the most hated person in town. But one hated him in a special way, not as one did a friend for tattling or a teacher for scolding. Certainly not as one hated his enemy. There was no hurt or vengeance or fear in one's hatred of Todd. It was without forethought or passion

or guilt—as impersonal as one's hate of the devil or of those imponderable abstractions that the minister says it is dutiful to hate. Others were commonly hated, but with some understanding. Of Jonathan Powers people said sadly: "He's such-a 'nimpossible old fool." At the mention of Myra Crawshaw, they shook their heads: "Poor Myra." But Ellery Todd! They curled their lips, unconsciously mimicking him: "That horrid old man!"

His face was lean, wrinkled, and hard. It was set in a sneer—his lips curled under his nose. Uph! the whole world was a great ugly smell. He was immaculately dressed: black suit, stiff-starched shirt of white, a sprig of honeysuckle in his lapel. Sitting on the gallery, fanning themselves with palmetto fans, their memories confused with old wishes and the present reality, people would see him coming down the street and they would turn to ask—as if he were a ghost, or a memory too vividly recalled: "Say, didn't he die?"

He walked slowly, preciously, bent at the waist. He was palsied. His arms shook. His feet jerked to the pavement as he flopped them out. He flashed his umbrella, clearing the way as if people were flies. He crossed the street, scowling at traffic, waving it all to a halt. Bicycles were inventions to torture him. Oh, he stopped in the middle of the crossing to shake his fist, to swing his umbrella: "You varmint!" Horses reared. Autos backed up slowly, waiting. Then he went on—out and flop—shaking his head and mumbling. People gave him clear berth, eyeing him aslant. Some nodded their heads perfunctorily. Then somebody—at a safe distance—would whistle. He would let out a yawp, like a rooster caught, and swing his umbrella against post or building or, but for Istrouma's caution, any passerby.

Principally it was little boys who whistled at Todd. They did it, not because they were mean—never that—but for the same reason they threw rocks at birds and strung mosquito hawks on a hatpin—the crisp wings fluttering, tearing the paperlike body, and then folding down still. But men whistled too—when they thought they were safe from critical eyes. They whistled just because of the meanness of old Todd, who thought the whole town owed obeisance to his ugly infirmities. And everyone knew that Mrs. Bean stood behind her green shutters to whistle furiously and long whenever he passed her house going to Attica Street.

He had always lived in Istrouma. Some could remember him as a boy and many could remember him as a young man. They could, but

they didn't. They remembered him only as a palsied eccentric, sneering at the world down the point of a threatening umbrella, spitting on the banq ıette if anyone ventured to smile at him or to speak: "Good morning, Mr. Todd." When people had cause to remember him of former years—"Ellery Todd was the teller then" or "We were surprised Ellery Todd ever married her"—they would pause, skeptical, and say, "That's *old* Mr. Todd, you know," and, despite their assertion, would continue their story as though there were no possible connection between the young teller in the National Bank and the old rebel who carried his umbrella like a stick.

None ever knew what went on in his mind, ever considered that he had a mind at all, was anything more than a jack-in-the-box popping out of his solitude and vibrating from side to side.

How could they guess his memories?

The two aunts who reared him, standing on each side of his bed, leaned over one after the other, to tuck the cover under his chin and brush the long curls back from his ears. "Not today, dear. You must rest." They smiled at the pallor of his face, confident that he would die. His hands crawled from under his chin like spiders and closed tight on the cover. The rawboned faces, hanging above him, were like the antimacassars which loomed through his lashes when he lay on the parlor floor peeping out at the world while pretending to sleep. He would clutch the cover against his neck, and the faces would go like the antimacassars becoming dragons, hard and determined and mean. The tightening of the thin fists grieved the aunts, though they never knew why. Want him to die? They thought that, instead, they would choose to die themselves. Dare they imagine that the restless fingers, like kittens nuzzling after the teat, were grasping at the cover, the house, the money—all the properties that were theirs, except for that grasp. They guarded him; they protected him. When they let him out in the yard to play, they watched him through every window. If it began to rain or if the sun got hot, if he put his hand on the gate or started to climb the fence, then the one with the hair screwed up on her head like a tilting pagoda whistled through her teeth and he had to come running.

Istrouma had known—and Istrouma had said—that the only reason the aunts lived together, hating each other, was Ellery Todd. And Is-

trouma had known that the bond was not for the child but for his money, for neither had anything of her own.

He was walked to and from school by one or the other of the stiff-backed spinsters. He was dressed in queer clothes and forbidden to get in the dust. He grabbed boys by the arms and little girls by the hair. He stole: pop guns, cap pistols, marbles. Even the teachers disliked him: "All that money too!" None imagined that, forbidden their world, he tried to snatch them into his own and, failing that, filched mementoes of their happiness.

The woman who married him stood at the dresser combing her red hair out like a mermaid. "Gonna walk down to Mattie's. Tired of the house. I'll tell Milly to listen for your bell." Her hands went through her hair like a spindle, rolling it up. He clutched the cover under his chin and pushed his hips down against his legs that lay as heavy as stone, and as still.

She lied!

But tensely he listened for the sound that would prove the lie, hoping that it might not come, knowing it would. She thrust a handful of pins into her mouth, then snatched them out one by one to jab them into her hair. His fingers tightened over the cover against the pain of the long forked pins thrust into his skull and there slowly turned to a clamp. Then came the whistle, gentle and distant, like a sound from memory. She stuck in the pins with both hands now, the flesh of her arms shaking soft and pendulous. Quickly she turned, pressing her fingers against her hair: "I won't be long."

The town knew what kind of woman she was. "She married him for his money. She ought to be satisfied with that." But it did not divine that she was the only one who had ever entered his world. And now, as his aunts had done, she only pretended to be part of it. He knew, as he had never known of his aunts, that she was waiting for him to die.

It was the dog alone that wanted to be part of his life. He was tawny, mongrel, and small—descriptive of neither his sex nor his species. "Pretty kitty cat," a child might say. "She's an ugly little hound," the grownups said.

At the edge of a vacant lot on Attica Street he peered up at Mr. Todd from under a shock of honeysuckle. Mr. Todd was an old man then—his wife lying beside his two aunts in a spot of ground he had gladly

deeded them all. Oh, how he had fooled them! Like characters in an old ballad, they had just "up and died."

Mr. Todd saw the eyes upturned from the drooping head. They had surprised him, like the eyes of the angel peering after your deeds. He walked on, stopped, looked back. The eyes had followed him. He glanced about. There was no one by. He cleared his throat. The dog ran out. At Mr. Todd's feet he bent his head and forepaws to the banquette, his tail standing high in the air and waving. He was thin and dirty. His hair was matted with beggar-lice.

This was the first gesture of friendship, of trust, ever made to old Todd. Yet, how familiar it seemed. How had he ever been deluded by his aunts and his wife? Perhaps for a great part of his life there had been no such gesture because, not expecting it, he had never invited it. But neither had he expected hatred and spite and disloyalty. Not at first. Yet those he provoked; and, growing used to them, he learned to expect them. They were habit now; they could no longer hurt. Oh, had there been an honest hand of friendship—*that* would have hurt, would have stirred his old heart to give one last leap and cease. He simply couldn't have stood it. Even this dog at his feet, this common fidelity, was too much for him. He was doubtful. The scoundrel might bite him yet. . . . And yet?

One would have thought the dog was as old as old Todd himself. He sometimes went at a trot, his ears flopping, his short legs stumbling over his paws. But mostly he walked along slowly, sniffing the grass apathetically. An anti-dog! There couldn't possibly be an interesting smell in the world! From time to time he would halt, turn round, and fix his eyes on Todd as though afraid the old fellow might run off onto the lawn or out into the street before an oncoming car. Seeing his charge plodding behind him, he would trot off a few paces to catch up with himself, then fall into his slow walk, sniffing the buttercups.

He was a grotesque little dog, impossibly ugly, yet smug and secure, thinking the whole town his private promenade. One could hardly resist—. What was it one wanted to do? To throw something! To growl like a mastiff! But one dared not. Not with the old man, dressed black as death, following behind, flouncing his umbrella like a walking cane. So one did what he could: he whistled.

The dog ignored them all. But one day he walked into a yard where Parker Bean was weeding his zinnias, and he lifted his leg against a

Japonica tree. Parker let fly such a kick that the dog rolled over the lawn and lay breathless. Then Parker sprawled down beside him, under a blow from the hooked handle of Todd's umbrella. The dog got up slowly, looked at his master. Then the two walked away—just as Molly Bean rushed down the steps crying out like one of the Katzenjammers: "Help! Help! Police!"

Mr. Todd was down on Attica Street when they caught him: Patrolman Mike Fisher and Parker and a score of trouble-bugs, excited, and eager for violence. They took him away, and he never said a word, didn't even look down at the tawny dog, peering up from beside the honeysuckle as if the secure life he had had with old Todd were only a passing hope—an impossible dream that had really never happened at all.

Mr. Todd spent three years in Jackson. When he came back, he shook more than ever and now flung his umbrella about like a stick. People asked: "Isn't that old Todd coming down the street?" and "Wasn't old Todd in Jackson?" And they said: "They should have kept him there. He's crazier than ever." But he walked down Attica Street for years—and up and down Third, his umbrella clearing his way, the sprig of honeysuckle in his black lapel. At night, as he walked down the Boulevard, the hanging lamps turned obliquely to meet him, conspiring to do him harm.

Then somebody discovered how to torture him. Without looking out once, you could follow his progress along the street—the taunting itinerant whistle coming closer and closer, then fading away. Oh, how his old arms flashed and how he battered his umbrella against the posts and the ground!

Forgetting for a while the murderous whistle that caught him like a lariat in the middle of Third and tripped him to death under a bus, people still imagine they see him—whenever they hear a sly whistle or feel the need of something to hate, something outside of themselves, apart from their own meanness, their failures, their guilt. Something harmless, defenseless, beyond the equity of their world.

Uncertain of their feelings as well as their memories, they often turn to ask: "Did old Todd ever die?" And sitting on their galleries, familiar sights stirring remembrance when their lives are dull, others say: "Remember old Mr. Todd—how he tore about when you whistled?"

But they still never wonder why he cringed at the whistle—any more than they wonder why a snail writhes under salt. It just does. "See, Sonny, spread it over his back. Watch him squirm up and just melt away."

THE ROAD TO CONSERVATION

By WHITNEY R. CROSS

THE NEW YORK *Herald Tribune* Forum on "Our Imperiled Resources" has recently brought to a momentary peak a volume of discussion which has been rising rapidly throughout the year. Only a month earlier, the centennial meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science featured the race between population increase and the food supply. Meanwhile, President Truman and Governor Dewey both tried to cast themselves in the role of exclusive sponsor of conservation while they toured the West. Bernard DeVoto has long been sniping from *Harper's* Easy Chair at the cattlemen's lobby for control of the public range. Fairfield Osborn's *Our Plundered Planet* and William Vogt's *Road to Survival,* both dire prophecies of famine, have become best-sellers. Quite suddenly, apparently, more people have become more conscious of resource exhaustion than ever before.

This spirited evangelism is all to the good. Any awakening of public opinion about such a basic problem of civilization represents positive gain. But like other new enthusiasms for old gospels, it seems to suffer some of the shortcomings of undirected zeal. As much heat as light has been generated by this year's discussions. The Presidential candidates contributed their share of warmth and shadow. Both talked with an optimism which in anyone but a politician would be foolhardy. Dewey promised so much more advancement under his guidance, without any New Deal regimentation, and with handsome tax cuts, that the record of the Democrats could in comparison be dismissed as insignificant. Osborn and Vogt, whose books both indicate that the problem is practically beyond solution, spoke in the October forum as if it could easily be solved with a little solid effort.

The forum program and the *Tribune* supplement which reported it likewise reveal startling contradictions. The program included sessions

---

WHITNEY R. CROSS is Assistant Professor of American History at Smith College. He is at work on a history of changing American attitudes toward the management of land and other national wealth.

on education, on security and freedom, and on "Goals for Leadership in the World Crisis," apparently assuming (correctly) that those subjects related to resource conservation. Yet none of the speeches on physical resources asked what conservation policy might mean for the development of democratic government; and none of the speakers in the other sessions reckoned particularly with the management of physical resources as a factor affecting their areas of discussion. Speech after speech on resources hinted at, but avoided grappling with, the necessity for integrated management by society's collective, political action. But Fairfield Osborn described conservation as a preventive of socialism (apparently meaning Russian Communism); and the supplement was paid for by corporation advertisements, a majority of which declared in substance that America's greatest resource was uninhibited individual enterprise!

So much excited confusion makes sober, purposeful thinking rather difficult. If all of this talk is to get results, we must acquire a sense of direction. We need to find out how conservation and democracy dovetail: to discover what each means in terms of the other. We urgently need what for want of a better term may be called a philosophy of conservation.

One way to gain sobriety and perspective is to study some of the informed literature of the subject, selected to bring over against the current discussions data and interpretations formulated by experts, writing in a reflective rather than a hortatory mood. I propose to discuss the interrelationship of conservation and democracy by referring to six recent books, and drawing conclusions of my own about their contribution to the issue. The first two, *Road to Survival* and *Our Plundered Planet,* serve to characterize the temper of the present public interest. Critical analysis of them will help to locate the vital center of the question. The other four are more specialized monographs, all with a degree of historical approach to lend added perspective. Three, Gifford Pinchot's *Breaking New Ground,* Richard Lillard's *The Great Forest,* and Rufus Terral's *The Missouri Valley,* were published in 1947, before the crusade reached fever pitch. The fourth, A. W. Griswold's *Farming and Democracy,* though published this year, was written without emphatic interest in resource utilization. Some thinking about the significance of these volumes, it seems to me, points the way towards a common-sense philosophy of conservation.

Vogt and Osborn describe an alarming situation. Old mother earth, and beyond her, the sun and the universe, behave according to a system of natural laws marvelously complex and, in their entirety, hardly open to the immediate knowledge of mankind. We know something, for instance, though not everything, about the hydrologic cycle which automatically regulates the moisture on the earth. We know that subterranean flow or absorption into plant life will hold up the evaporation and the run-off of waters which fall on our land surfaces. Destruction of forests may make it impossible for either animals or plants to live. But we have much to learn about the kind of forestry and soil management which will serve to hold the maximum amount of water.

Other cycles make plant and animal life support each other. Just as bees, alfalfa, cow manure, nitrogen-fixing bacteria and soil chemicals are all involved with each other and with our milk and beef supply, so in similar fashion all the worms, insects, birds, and wild animals contribute to intricately balanced patterns which control all the living species. Carnivorous animals, men included, normally operate in this economy as a minor force, in fact virtually as parasites, and only a small number can be supported by the earth upon the annual yield of its natural system. The other meat-eaters have behaved themselves, and even man was until quite recently a very small species in number, but when he reached his intellectual maturity a few centuries ago, he began to make trouble.

Two tendencies then commenced which could lead only to disaster. First, men proceeded with their superior knowledge to exploit and destroy the capital goods of the earth, instead of continuing to live on the income, and this process continued at a geometrically growing rate. Second, their science so tempered their own environment and remedied their own infirmities, that the human death rate failed to keep pace with the birth rate. Since about 1600, man has multiplied four times, and he may total three, instead of two billion, in another hundred years.

Osborn and Vogt both analyze the continents to show that these co-ordinately destructive trends have nearly run to their limit. Large areas of mountain and desert, of course, never were arable. The arctic and tropic regions appear to be counted out because they create such difficulties for both farming and living. Mismanagement of other territories has reduced the locations of former high civilizations to virtual desert. Whether for natural reasons or some of human origin, most of Australia,

Africa, Asia, South America, and the Mediterranean basin seem to be if not sterile, at least incapable of the major productive expansion required for a growing population. The rich triangle of black earth in southern Russia, a few parts of western Europe, and the Missouri-Mississippi Basin of the United States appear to be the main reliance for our rapidly expanding dietary needs. Even these choice spots have been seriously damaged by careless farming and by war, either through direct spoilation, or through an emergency production so far exceeding the normal yield as to cause permanent loss of fertility.

But what of man's famed scientific and mechanical prowess? Have we not the means of restoring and adding to the useful soils? These two eminent scientists agree in their books that the likelihood is slight or nonexistent that we can ever undertake in foolproof fashion conscious management of the cycles of nature. Genetics research and soil chemistry, to be sure, can increase yields per acre and per man under ideal circumstances. But social, cultural, and economic factors dictate that maximum utilization can be had only on a very few acres, like those run by the agricultural colleges in the American Middle West. Furthermore, Vogt points out, the soil has an innate "carrying capacity" which puts an absolute limit to all such increases of production.

Osborn believes that our limitless faith in science and technology is the most potent enemy of sensible conservation. Ignorant recklessness caused much of our past waste, but not all of it. Even when we supposed ourselves informed and wise, lack of some missing link of knowledge led us into sad errors. Dry farming techniques produced the dust bowl. Flood control and navigation improvement have usually proceeded at the expense of soil conservation rather than in a way to advance it. Even TVA gets slight sympathy from Vogt. Wide use of DDT may yet extinguish useful insects and bacteria, sterilizing great areas of soil, just as bird destruction in the past allowed certain insect pests to ravage crops unmercifully.

Both of these men write Malthusian books, though only Vogt pays his progenitor specific respects. Both argue the inevitability of man's rapid decrease, through starvation, to a number which the despoiled earth can support on its slighter remaining increment. Excepting Vogt's fillip for birth control, both indicate the total inability of brain power to remedy the damage man's partial knowledge has wrought. Unless he turns back,

gives up action for fear of error, and nearly sterilizes himself, man would seem to be rapidly approaching his destruction.

During the *Herald Tribune* Forum, both authors contradicted the position taken by their books. But they offered no apology for their previous pessimism, nor did they marshal any adequate evidence to explain away their earlier arguments. Presumably, what they wrote at leisure should still represent their considered judgment. Even in the books, however, a conflict of ideas is evident. Both volumes are essentially tracts, scarcely intended to make the reader run for arsenic, but rather by implication supposing that somehow we can prevent starvation. The authors' later, more optimistic emphasis is perhaps less a contradiction, fundamentally, than a mere continuation of a severe confusion.

The weakness of both books is one shared by much of the current conservationist discussion. The trouble is that the problem is too big. It crosses the fixed lines of professional specialization. Scientists know the physical facts of nature, but lose their way in the field of the social scientists, and the social scientists are no better off in the fortress of natural science. Vogt and Osborn arrive at the pessimistic side of their argument through a misunderstanding in an area of speculation beyond their normal ken. They mix up the possible limitations on potential human action which come from two entirely different causes. One has to do with the knowledge man may attain as he explores the universe. If limitations along this line existed, they would be absolute ones, but few such boundaries can be fixed. The other, involving shortcomings of human character which keep society as a whole from utilizing what is already known, certainly provides limitations, but only flexible ones which vary as society changes. These authors mistake the one type for the other, and consequently make relatives appear to be absolutes. They present as if it were a matter of conclusive scientific proof, what in fact is only a partially informed opinion about human behavior.

Obviously, we know how to get more food. We can restore forests where they will resuscitate sterile slopes and regulate water flow. We can retain the fertility of our good soils and even slowly increase it. We can get more pork from every hog and more corn off every stalk. We can learn to irrigate rich arid lands without ruining them. We can even see looming ahead more daring ventures for bigger stakes (and more steaks), as increasing knowledge will permit present hints to become real poten-

tialities. We may predigest and render edible the grasses, or even the trees, which can be grown on poorer soils; or shoot off dry ice in the clouds to make it rain where we need moisture instead of where we have too much; or apply radioactive or other charges to soils or plants to stimulate growth; or devise means to restore soil life more quickly through bacteriology and chemistry; or utilize more sea resources or raise lands out of the oceans; or solve some of the difficulties of tropic and arctic agriculture. Cheaper, more abundant energy from nuclear fission may make economically feasible developments which now seem impossible.

All such prospects, however, depend on an immense *if*. We have to reckon with human cussedness. Suppose scientists learn all the answers. How can the world's farmers, a numerous and ignorant lot, possibly be educated in time? And how can the world's industrialists, a selfish lot when not also ignorant, be pushed into line? This is the crux of the problem. This is where the whole question of conservation descends from the utopia of science to the earthy level of human policy. This is where the nature of democracy must be considered. And this is where many of our present commentators run into difficulty, because of their obsession with another vital current issue, the opposition between the United States and Russia. They insist on identifying democracy with economic individualism exclusively, and socialization of any sort with Soviet Communism, largely ignoring the strong, lengthy, and growing trend towards a democratic collectivism in this country.

Science and technology can undoubtedly feed us. But they cannot function unless social action conforms to what they require. The scientist, for instance, may dictate birth control, but it cannot be gained without legislation and educational, religious, moral, and medical changes. If the scientist proposes intelligent national planning for the most efficient use of forest and water resources, the social scientist must devise ways to attain a governmental authority hitherto unknown in democracies, without infringing on the vital personal liberties of the citizenry; and the politician must refrain from misrepresenting the specialist's purposes as he proceeds.

Federal law might well have to control the cutting of private timber and its allotment for paper, plywood, or lumber. The law might extend to total management of both surface and ground waters. No supply would

then go unused, or be allowed to yield electric power without at the same time providing navigation, irrigation, flood control, fish preservation, soil conservation, bathing, boating, and drinking supplies. Also, the proportion of electricity to come from falling water might be calculated against the supplies of coal, oil, and nuclear energy, and the entrepreneurs in all these fields of production would have to be correspondingly controlled. The resources of one country must probably be managed in relation to those of other states, necessitating large grants of power to some world organization. If some peoples prosper while others starve, war will come to consume the living of future eons. The gains of research and invention, constantly changing the techniques of resource management, would have to be socialized, democratized, and internationalized.

Once we start thinking about systematic control of resources to guarantee survival, the ramifications never stop expanding. They interlink with every other known issue. Conservation, therefore, turns out to be not a specific question at all, but a generic one. It simply means, as do all other momentous current problems, that man must learn to operate the world he lives in, intelligently and collectively. If starvation threatens, it does not create an isolated situation. It rather makes our general crisis the more acute.

To reverse the emphasis of our alarmists, it seems sensible to believe that *if* we can mature the devices of democratic, international social control and planning, we will enter into an era not of scarcity but of abundance. There will be plenty of food for all, whatever medicine and the birth rate do to population trends, and plenty of energy to perform all the operations which civilization may need. And at the same time and for the same reason, the peace will be preserved, the international economy will work, and men can enjoy the pursuit of happiness until that far, far distant time when the second law of thermodynamics dictates the demise of the solar system. But if we fail to achieve a philosophy and practice of active, collective planning, we shall not have to worry about starvation in particular. Our general situation will verge upon collapse in any case, and whether famine or war happens to reach us first will matter very little.

This is our choice. Will we elect to be at once saved and fed, or starved and damned? On this point we need instruction and perspective,

to know whether our chance is worth the effort it will take. Is it within the realm of possibility that feeble humans may change their ways? In the recent past, do any data suggest that the people of a democracy can learn something about social planning and alter their traditional attitudes towards resources in a reasonable length of time?

The personal testimony of Gifford Pinchot is probably the best evidence to be found in the United States. *Breaking New Ground* is the inside story, only slightly warped by rather obvious personal biases, of the Theodore Roosevelt administration's development of a policy and program, even a political philosophy of conservation. This record proves that under the appropriate circumstances of a reforming mood in the public, a dynamic executive, and a small coterie of informed experts close to the executive's ear, a broad, intelligent, and efficient resource management can be set in motion in a very brief period.

Pinchot offers equally positive proof that the removal of the dynamic executive, when Taft replaced Roosevelt, could with equal rapidity terminate the program and even undo a great portion of it. So the New Deal had the job to do over again, with a somewhat similar sequel. The real point of the Pinchot story, reinforced by our own experience, seems to be that democracy can perform the necessary actions, but has not yet learned enough persistence. This continuity of intelligent action in government may need to be one focus of our attention.

In *The Great Forest,* Richard Lillard documents the same case with a different emphasis. His book deals with the role of the forests in society throughout American history. Without directing itself straight at the subject, it becomes a very effective plea for conservation. But the important thing is that over long periods of time, Americans have been intimately and extensively interested in the woods. As society has changed, bringing about altered supplies and uses of tree products, public attitudes have slowly but inexorably evolved. Almost unconsciously, in spite of itself, in response to the vigorous work of a very small and informed minority, American society has learned what should be done to preserve the forests, and has at least begun to do it. We never moved as fast as we ought to, to be sure, perhaps not fast enough even to meet utter necessities. But we have changed our attitudes, thoroughly and consistently. We can, then, remake our minds slowly, but need to speed up the reaction. Cultural lag appears to be another major element of the conservation problem.

But soil conservation may well be a more difficult problem than forest renewal. At least since the Civil War, American agricultural difficulties have stemmed from overproduction instead of from scarcity. Even in this century, during the early conservation movement, this was true. Teddy Roosevelt's innovations in irrigation aimed primarily to gain new plots for small farmers, in the interest of a democratic land distribution, rather than to increase crops because of any dearth. The New Deal Soil Conservation Service likewise, if it had one eye for soil fertility, kept the other glued to the avoidance of a surplus. If a world food shortage was developing all these years, it never came effectively to our attention. Overproduction still looks to be our weakness, and even though that excess is the very despoiler of the soil's permanent fertility, it will continue to be difficult to see the wolf in this sheepskin cloak.

Even more serious than the novelty of the idea of scarcity is the fact that adequately comprehensive soil conservation requires vastly augmented governmental controls, far beyond anything forestry alone would demand. Something could be done for the wood supply by merely retaining the forested public domain, but virtually no arable land now remains to be protected by federal ownership. Large private lumbermen, when finally convinced of the necessity, could easily turn to sustained-yield tree farming; but our agriculturists number millions who might have to suffer government control not only of crop acreage, quantity and prices, but also of all farm techniques, grazing practices, water supplies, and over-all land use. Traditional individualists like our farmers have much to learn to co-operate in such revolutionary procedures. Even if the farmers were transformed, industrialists would be involved equally, at every point where their enterprises touched upon agriculture. We might have to direct fertilizer manufacture, all minerals useful on the farm or exchangeable as raw materials with crops from the land, and all production of rural power supplies. Needless to say, businessmen will fight such procedures to the bitter end. The politician who promises comprehensive soil conservation without invasion of the freedom of private enterprise is making a neat combination of mutual exclusives. No miracle could make both possible at once.

Presumably, a society which has demonstrated ability to learn something about forestry can repeat the performance in husbandry, once the necessity appears to be sufficiently compelling. But the immensity of the

change of attitude required in this case scarcely justifies overweening confidence that we can meet the soil management challenge successfully.

Rufus Terral's factual, informal, chatty survey of *The Missouri Valley* focuses this challenge in the region which is probably the most vital for any substantial expansion of American farm production. He demonstrates the amazing complexity of the task of resource control in such a region. The shifting, treacherous, loam-filled Missouri has to be disciplined into a suitable, fixed channel and cleansed of the top soil it pours down the Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico. Forestry in the Rockies and grazing in the upper plains must be guided to increase the water supply. Localized underground reservoirs and artesian wells must be utilized without exploitation for the whole valley instead of for a few immediate beneficiaries; and the kind of planning required must solve the ill-conceived and conflicting riparian law of nine or more states. The plains grasses must be restored by ingenious research in plant genetics and by comprehensive control of farm practices. Tree planting must be studied, planned, and executed, for wind protection. The people of the valley, accustomed to state loyalties and bound by all existing lines of transportation to east-west orientations in belts across the valley, must somehow learn to work together in one unit. They must forget their antipathy to federal "meddling" in local affairs, and avoid being taken in by a variety of special interests, including the railroads, the United States Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, each of which wants some particular development which would ruin the others needed to bring about a balanced, efficient use of all resources. Only a regional federal agency empowered to plan comprehensively can do the job.

The hazards, difficulties, and complexities of a proper soil conservation policy are seen at their maximum in this particular region, and the author does them entire justice. But he also indicates the rich potential, the abundant wealth to be poured forth among the inhabitants and over the world, by the total conquest of the land. In few other spots could the diametrically opposed alternatives be so sharply defined. With planning of the right sort, the Missouri Valley can be one of the gardens of the earth. Without it, the section will rapidly degenerate into a desert.

The scholarly investigations of A. W. Griswold in *Farming and Democracy* open up other avenues of reflection. Turning back to the age of Jefferson, Griswold discovers that the society of small owner-operated-

farm families was so firmly fixed in the American mind as the prerequisite condition of democracy, that we have ever since assumed the vital relationship of the two.

Yet the trend has turned against the little farmer. He is today not only an uneconomical producer, contributing only a mite to the major crop totals, but he also finds himself deprived of the social benefits which urban dwellers enjoy. Rather than the stellar parent of liberty and virtue in the midst of landed plenty, the small husbandman has become the residuary legatee of an inheritance which fails to outlast the first beneficiary. British experience in large-scale farming has not interrupted developing democracy, while the French worship of the small farmer system, even more fanatical than our own, has done little to strengthen that country's democratic governments.

Our traditional belief has confused Americans, even up to the present. New Deal agricultural policy moved in contrary directions. On one hand, through the triple A plans, crop and price controls worked for efficient production and, incidentally, for good soil utilization, without regard for the equality of the members of the rural community. On the other hand, the Resettlement, Farm Security, and Rural Electrification agencies aimed at the maintenance of the traditional little farmer, whose only claim upon the national purse lay in his dire need, and in the probably mistaken sentiment of Americans for Thomas Jefferson's agrarianism.

Griswold keenly raises questions rather than dictating definitive answers. He assumes the continuing abundance of food, so he could hardly be expected to draw conclusions about the relation of democracy to resource management. But his approach must be applied to the question, nevertheless, before we jump to hasty conclusions about its dimensions.

The freedoms of democracy remain our goals, as they do for the French and the British. These are the criteria against which Griswold measures the small-farmer tradition and finds it wanting. The same criteria will be applied by inhabitants of democratic countries to all prospective conservation policies. If proper soil utilization should by chance require the sacrifice of our personal liberties, we should probably prefer to drift along as we are. Our present temporary abundance would shield us from starvation while others underwent famine, until world revolution ended civilization, or until we realized too late for effective action that we ourselves were on the verge of ruin.

But we shall not have to give up democracy. Experience will more likely prove that conservation simply cannot be accomplished in any other than a democratic fashion. No group slighter than the whole people can adequately plan for civilization's survival. Any smaller, special interest comes inevitably to grind its own axe. If a capitalist plutocracy gets control, it will consider its own immediate profits first. If a Communist Party dictatorship held the reins, it would put the conversion or liquidation of the otherwise-minded first, and then stifle the liberty of expression and thought which alone could keep a program advancing. If a Hitler took over, he might gain efficiency in detail, but surely would pervert any gain to his own use. All of us, acting in concert, cannot abolish selfishness in member groups, but we can impose an ultimate purpose which transcends their more petty intentions. Planning of soil use must probably be democratic if the people accustomed to democracy are to accept it; at the same time it must build upon majority consent in order to keep shooting at the right goal.

To educate the world's farmers and their industrial collaborators to new democratic ideas of resource control may seem an insuperable task. It will be less so in proportion as people come to understand Professor Griswold's discovery. We do not require millions of small farm owners either for democracy or for efficient soil use. Larger, fewer, better-trained farmers will doubtless prove more teachable, as well as more productive.

Yet if we should allow the absolutely converse situation to develop, we might escape the griddle only to broil in the flames. Monopoly-scale farmers would probably be as troublesome as monopolistic industrialists have been. Griswold finds that the statistics of farm size do not describe any inevitable trend toward unlimited bigness. Regional and crop demands, when economic efficiency is the sole determinant, make for an extremely variegated mixture of sizes and kinds of enterprise. The point is that neither size, nor the kind of organization, nor the question of ownership, tenancy, or labor, are *ipso facto* functions of democracy. The farm laborer can be protected in his rights just as city laborers are; and the leaseholder or tenant can be secured in his fundamental liberties without making him accumulate the capital for ownership, or assume the consequent risks.

But here a startling paradox may appear. We failed to save the little farmer in the industrial age by trying specifically to do so, and he failed

to foster the particular virtues of democracy. The kind of conscious policy which aimed at improving agriculture's immediate prosperity without putting long-run soil preservation first, moreover, helped only the big farmer at the expense of the small one. But once we forget about the Jeffersonian agrarian and let farm prosperity become a mere incident to planning for the future, we may quite possibly find at least the middle-sized farmer revived and placed in an equitable relationship to the big one.

For when electricity rates, freight tariffs, water and fertilizer supplies, and soil building techniques are planned and regulated by government, equally for all, in the interest of maximum land use, the big farmer will lose several of the advantages which his capital superiority has given him in the past. The TVA represents our nearest approach to a workable system of comprehensive, democratic resource management, and under TVA the smaller independent farmer has gained remarkably. But this kind of farmer knows which side of the bread his butter spreads on, and will be no ignorant, viciously narrow-minded opponent of government planning.

Griswold's insights into agriculture and democracy prompt indirectly even more vital ideas about conservation policy and democracy. Why should the Jeffersonians have mistakenly identified the little, independent farmer with the democratic liberties? Was there not some foundation for their belief? Did they not perhaps mistake a momentary embodiment for an underlying and permanent reality? What did the eighteenth-century American yeoman have which made him the symbol of equality and liberty?

He had a rude abundance of food, clothing, and shelter; and with an open continent to the West, the same sufficiency lay easily available to all. The historian, Frederick Jackson Turner, said that the existence of unutilized land on every new frontier developed and constantly renewed democracy in the United States. Perhaps the land itself was not responsible, but rather the fact that its existence made for a plentiful supply of the rudimentary materials for a livelihood. Britain too, has been a fortress of democracy, gaining in the past an ample plenty from colonial frontiers and overseas trade elsewhere. If we look abroad to see why democracies have failed, we discover that scarcity of the fundamentals for living, or an artificial lack of them in a given place and

moment, contributed something to almost every undemocratic movement in recent times.

Simple abundance may very probably be a major prerequisite for democracy. How can democracy survive, then, if as Vogt and Osborn and others tell us, the world seems destined for fairly immediate starvation? Fortunately, that destiny is not inevitable. The modern equivalent of the old frontier does exist, not only for the United States, but for all nations, in the social planning of scientific soil use. The abundance which of yore came to us gratuitously must now be earned by everybody, through active community intelligence. There is probably no other "road to survival" for democracy.

Conservation by active management thus becomes as necessary to continued democratic government as democratic method is vital for the pursuit of conservation. Neither can be had without the other, and both must be utilized together to ward off famine.

Here appears to be no broad, smooth highroad, but a straight and narrow and exceedingly rugged pathway to survival. It is perhaps even a dimmer prospect than the extreme pessimists suggest. If the situation were really beyond our control, we could eat, drink, and be merry until the day of judgment, with a free conscience. Or if legal birth control would suffice, as Vogt hopes, such a simple panacea might be accomplished with relative ease.

Our task is far more difficult. We must overhaul democracy at home, streamlining it with efficient administration and comprehensive, integrated planning of resource utilization. Human cussedness, or in the older term, original sin, raises mountainous obstacles at every point in the path. We must deal with cultural lag by the persuasive, educational methods, and find ways to keep our political cycles from disturbing the continuity of constructive policies.

Just at this moment, we must avoid the pitfall into which the books of Osborn and Vogt unintentionally lead us. The idea that nature cannot be adequately controlled through political action comes too close for comfort to the outworn natural-law economics. It lives next door to the dangerous notion that any government supervision of private enterprise is necessarily inefficient or ill-advised. Equally dangerous is the closely related fallacy that any increased government enterprise is subversive: that because the Russians also try to plan, any remotely similar operations here must therefore be communistic and not democratic.

The sin of selfish interest will continue to throw organized business and often organized agriculture, labor, or bureauracy across the pathway to survival. Presumably, we never will eliminate original sin. But we can maneuver the sentiments of opposing groups from time to time against the offender of the moment. So, with slight deviations from its center, we can pass along the trail, skirting the successive obstructions. Compromise and expediency, within the limits of fixed principles, must ever be the democratic method. The perfectionist will suffer constant disillusionments, and might as well jump off the first cliff as continue climbing the path. TVA assuredly is far from perfect, as Vogt takes great pains to suggest, but it nevertheless marks the entrance to the trail.

When we look abroad, our task seems even more Herculean. We must spread both conservation and democracy, in collaboration with other politically mature nations, patiently and persuasively. We must see that everybody has the comfortable abundance which fosters deliberative methods of government, so far as it lies in our power to do so without strengthening the outright enemies of our entire position; and we must avoid patronizing airs, while we allow for differences of temperament, tradition and experience. Above all, we must shun war, which surely would consume the future food supply, even if civilization could otherwise survive the debacle.

All of these propositions expect a very great deal of human nature. Perhaps our chance of survival is slight, after all. But the farther we go in demanding much of mankind, the closer we come to the very tap root of traditional democracy. Democracy has always been optimistic about human nature, and despite questionings, we are still fundamentally democrats. In the proportion that we are true to our heritage, we shall be prepared to fight for our chance, however slim it may look to be.

A real philosophy of conservation thus becomes a thoroughly comprehensive democratic radicalism, incorporating consistent attitudes on practically every issue of the contemporary world. Lacking such a philosophy, our politicians argue in circles, propose programs whose parts are incompatible, and assume an entirely unjustified air of genial optimism. Lacking such a philosophy, our scientists make gloomy predictions, quite valuable to provoke serious, purposeful thought. But they unwittingly lead us astray all too often; and they fail in general to give us adequate advice about where we should turn, or what we should do to be saved.

PHILOSOPHIC HUMANISM TODAY

By GEORGE R. GEIGER

THERE ARE TIMES when "humanism" seems to provoke only nostalgia. Like "liberalism." It brings back memories of an unburied past, of an improbable past innocent of Maritain, Toynbee, Niebuhr, Aldous Huxley, Dr. Hutchins, Existentialism, and Bulgarian Democracy. In those ante-doom days "humanism" was not necessarily equated with "scientism" or "materialism"; nor was it to be disposed of by showing à la Cyril Connolly and Evelyn Waugh, that it had nothing to say when confronted by Death, Evil, or The Individual—all in the upper case. For *The Loved One* is apparently what happens when "American Materialism"—at least the Southern California or ultramontane variety—meets the Facts of Death face to face with the cosmetician.

Not that the latterday prophets don't have a point. After all, these are the days which make liberals tired, and humanists neurotic. But it is one thing to admit that middle age, the promise of war, and the atomic age are too much for us, and that, furthermore, our stomachs are too weak for alcohol and our diaphragms for Yoga: this would be welcome and healing honesty. It is quite another thing to throw up one's hands in a sophisticated horror at something called indifferently Science, man's unholy Pride in intelligence, Cosmic Impiety, or simply Americanism. To rationalize contemporary defeatism by insisting that the clock be turned back to the Upanishads, or to medieval Catholicism, or to a prescientific Metaphysic of Absolutes seems to be the most desperate kind of self-humiliation, a masochism having little to recommend it but the quality of being unappreciated by bourgeois souls.

The "humanism" which is being held up as the arch-fiend behind our modern troubles—the Belial celebrated by Huxley's ape-men—is

---

GEORGE R. GEIGER, national secretary-treasurer of the American Philosophical Association, has recently returned to Antioch College after teaching philosophy at the University of Wisconsin. His latest book is *Philosophy and the Social Order.*

easily identified by both friends and enemies. It signifies a complex of beliefs: that man *can* solve his problems—not necessarily that he *will* solve them; that man must rely on his own efforts and not expect to be helped by magic, however it be named; that those efforts toward an understanding of the world, himself, and his culture must be directed along the path (it is a broad path not a narrow one) laid down by the still-pioneering explorations known as scientific method; that, finally, nature is not opaque to human intelligence nor is it a mystic cipher of the unutterable—that humanism is also naturalism.

These basic assumptions of philosophic humanism are simply being noted. They are not to be defended at length here, and if they are to be taken for granted—as all postulates are taken for granted—they are being understood in the broadest possible sense. That is, the many detailed questions about, for example, the precise meaning of "scientific method," about its techniques and its extent and its future, are being passed over. For what is being challenged today is not so much technique as the whole spirit of humanism, the temper and attitude of mind which has confidence in man's resources—or, more accurately, which has confidence in nothing else. Whether readers of this journal accept some such assumptions as the foregoing cannot easily be determined, but the readers may be assured that, unlike the situation in American philosophy a generation ago, premises like these have become increasingly suspect—even the editors of *Life* magazine recognize this.

Recently that eminent publication sponsored a symposium on "The Meaning of Happiness." (To what degree *Life's* new and morbid interest in philosophic problems stems from the genius of an editor now famous for his publicized change from Communism to religion cannot be judged.) It might have been expected that the "mother-of-the-year" and the churchmen who participated in the symposium would have agreed on an ineffable and sanctified version of happiness; what was not so predictable was the lining up of eminent professional philosophers from the Ivy League along the antihumanist axis. The ethical pronouncements of Eddie Guest and Ella Wheeler Wilcox seemed to prevail, and for once the philosophic spectrum began to shrink, bringing the ultraviolets and infrareds close together. There were a few notable exceptions (Sidney Hook, as might be guessed), but the symposium on happiness provided a rather dreary footnote to the retreat from humanism, particularly

dreary because it gave evidence, however trivial the circumstance, that the retreat is being forlornly encouraged in many circles of American academic philosophy. (Which should be of especial interest to present-day discussions of education.)

As a matter of fact, the original purpose of this article was to outline the present status of American philosophy. For a number of reasons that idea had to be abandoned. The difficulty was not that the writer would be accused of fouling his nest; nor was it the embarrassing necessity for naming names or the still more embarrassing alternative of a code. A more powerful deterrent was simply the obvious danger of overgeneralizing, of making things more simple (and more dark) than they are. But if a review of contemporary academic philosophy does not seem feasible, a bare mention—admittedly arbitrary—may be made of certain rather obvious trends.

The drift of American philosophy is in the direction of antihumanism and antinaturalism. This would not necessarily apply to a list, say, of the dozen leading American philosophers (if such a list could be drawn up . . .), but it would apply if a surveyor went from university to university, and from one graduate department of philosophy to another. Various forms of idealism would naturally be expected because of the Anglo-American nineteenth century tradition, but it is not the remnants of Hegelian or personalistic Christian idealism which are puzzling; it is the appearance of subtle and gnostic forms of what can only be termed crpyto-idealism which presents a problem. To be sure, a problem is presented only if one has a certain stereotype of what American philosophy ought to be! But stereotypes can't be avoided. They are fatal only if they are too narrowly drawn and resist all change. In the present case, for instance, the humanistic stereotype is decidedly a generous one which would include the various attitudes labeled realistic, empirical, naturalistic, and so on. The touchstone of judgment, to change the figure, is not, say, some particular form of pragmatism, such as John Dewey's instrumentalism. Instrumentalism as a philosophy of science could be challenged in some of its details without any challenge being made of humanism or naturalism. But the neo-idealisms which dot the campuses of America are in a different category. They are avowedly and belligerently reactionary. (The word is used in its literal sense, not as a smear.)

"Idealism" is an awkward label, even when confined to its use in technical philosophy. In that setting, of course, it signifies belief in a reality whose fundamental ground is consciousness. In the present context the meaning is more general: "idealism" is to be understood as a philosophy which recommends the elevation of religion over science, of faith and intuition over reason, of soul or spirit over "mere" human behavior. This is a broad usage, somewhat different from the way the word has been traditionally employed, especially in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; yet this general connotation is becoming familiar in and out of philosophic circles, even though, as with "scientism" and "materialism," it is turning into a term of abuse rather than of description.

The programs and platforms appearing in this philosophic setting are diverse. There is, for one thing, the strictly religious form of supernaturalism, whether it be Catholic, Protestant, Hebrew, or Vedanta. This need not concern us since it is neither cryptic nor—except for variations like those of Maritain, Niebuhr, and Huxley—novel. It is the nonsectarian idealisms or antinaturalisms we have in mind, the ones which have been rallying around watchwords like Back to Absolutes and Return to Metaphysics. The Absolutes refer to Truth, and Truth stems from Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, or their fellow travelers. The alternatives here are clearly Absolute-Relative, Philosophy-Science, Knowledge-Opinion, Good-Bad. Similarly, the appeal to Metaphysics is not the plausible contention that the nature of the world should be investigated. It is instead an appeal to a particular kind of Metaphysic. Back to Metaphysics means back to Ultimate Spirit, to the Transcendental, to God. Neo-idealism is avowedly counter-revolutionary and re-actionary.

But "idealism" in no way exhausts the contemporary forms of academic nonnaturalism and nonhumanism. There is what can be called, with some malice, dilettantism. In extreme form it comes close to crypto-idealism, as in the mystic and Pythagorean worship of mathematical symbols. In less extreme cases it more resembles the art-for-art's-sake deviation to which professional philosophy is peculiarly susceptible. Mathematical logic for the sake of mathematical logic, logical analysis for the sake of logical analysis, a supreme defy to relevance and a noble contempt for the vulgarities of (obscenity-of-obscenities) "social significance"—here is the rise of a new party line in American philosophy.

There is exaggeration, overstatement, and sorrow in these lines but not enough to invalidate the charge. Whole sections of American philosophy have become pallid, constipated, and defeatist. The evidence is there in the men themselves, in the professional conventions, in the books, in the trade papers. Fortunately, this is only part of the picture. It will be more pleasant to notice the other parts.

II

Nerve failure in many regions of the body philosophic has happily come far short of general paralysis. Large areas of healthy tissue can be observed if one examines a number of books on scientific humanism which have appeared in the somewhat recent past, books not from the old guard of American humanism—men like John Dewey himself, Max Otto, Sidney Hook, and the like—but from others much more respectably orthodox. A number of these writers disagree flatly with major tenets of pragmatism and instrumentalism; nevertheless they are still on the side of the angels in not yet having sold man down the river to the plantations of hocus pocus.

One of the most interesting of these books is practically unknown to the general American reading public, although it has been adequately noticed in the academic world. It is *The Open Society and Its Enemies* by K. R. Popper.[1] The author, a refugee, teaches the logic of science at the University of London, and his book created quite a stir in England at the time of its appearance. To be sure, this is not an American work, and, as is the case with too many European thinkers—Karl Mannheim is a prime example—Popper ignores almost completely American writers who have been for years exploring the very field to which *The Open Society* offers its contribution; but, in spite of some notable lapses, the book makes a great deal of humanistic sense and it should be included in any roundup of anti-obscurantist literature.

The thesis of Popper's significant volumes lies in its counterattack upon what he regards as the perennial sabotage of human reason and human liberty. If civilization has any meaning or definition, he argues,

---

[1]London, George Routledge and Sons, 1947 ed. Vol. I—*The Spell Of Plato;* Vol. II —*The High Tide Of Prophecy: Hegel and Marx.* The book was finished, according to the author, in 1943, and so the attack on contemporary totalitarianism furnishes a news peg for it.

it must be found in the nurturing of humaneness and reasonableness, qualities which are precisely the ones which have been brushed aside by so many of even the intellectual leaders of mankind (the names mentioned in the subtitles of the two volumes indicate some examples—in particular, Plato and Hegel are the prime saboteurs). Civilized man can be found only in the "open society," one which celebrates the critical powers of men and the free spirit; "closed society" (the terms are from Bergson) is tribal society, dominated by total submission to magical forces. The birth-trauma of the open society as it tore loose from the closed still confuses us; in fact, parturition has not been entirely complete and there is still a yearning for the womb.

More specifically, the book is a long and elaborate criticism of "historicism." As Hegel, Marx, and, in our own day, Toynbee represent it, historicism is the belief in historical necessity, the belief that history has a meaning and that we can prophesy from it. This cataleptic notion, according to Popper, has been largely responsible for the backwardness of social science; indeed the whole concept of scientific law has been misunderstood by the historicists. Scientific law is descriptive not prophetic; it has no meaning in the moral or oracular sense. Historicism is a mystical and superstitious attempt to give facts a significance in and for themselves, whereas whatever meaning they have must be derived from us. In his closing pages Popper makes the belligerent claim that History has indeed no meaning whatsoever, since History *per se* doesn't even exist. There are *histories,* i.e., specific accounts of concrete happenings—Zinsser's notable record of rats, lice, men, and disease would be an illustration. But what we all have learned in school and college as "history" is, unfortunately, but a specific and bloody story of power politics, which has been elevated to be history-in-general. The occult worship of the alleged march of historical determinism, either materialistic or transcendental, has given us myth not reason, prophets to be obeyed rather than scientists to be understood, tribal heroes instead of social engineers.

But what is humanistic about a technical critique of historical method? Why is Popper's work a noteworthy contribution to sanity? The answer lies in what he calls "pragmatic rationalism." If History is not an incarnate Force rumbling along on an inevitable track, then men have some share in making their own destinies; they are not simply

the pawns of a World-Force interpreted by a World-Leader or Class. When men are duped by historical legerdemain they already have sacrificed part of their critical faculties, and once a part has been suppressed it is supremely easy for all to go. Surrender to History and its Prophet is a return to the tribalism of a closed society, whether the Prophet be a Plato or Marx, a Spengler or Toynbee.

In line with Popper's thesis is his plea for the adoption of the piecemeal methods of science to social change. Not over-all planning but bits-and-pieces reform is what the social engineer must recommend. This, again, is opposed to historicism with its counsel of sweeping reconstruction to fit in with the majestic tread of a marching destiny.

There are many difficult and unacceptable points in Popper's argument and they will be returned to in the next section. But here is a writer who still has confidence in the critical powers of human intelligence. That confidence has been lost, in large measure, because a pseudosophisticated worship of history has been substituted for a sober understanding of scientific method.

A quite different form of humanism is found in Professor Northrop's *The Logic Of The Sciences And The Humanities.*[2] The author of the well known *The Meeting Of East And West* has carried over his attempted philosophical fusion of the Orient and the Occident to a related and equally dramatic fusion of science and the arts. His argument is mostly a technical one that employs the now familiar terms of "concepts by intuition" and "concepts by postulation" to cement man's fragmentized experiences. For our purposes, however, what must be underlined is Northrop's suggested synthesis of problem-solving in all fields of human endeavor. His chapters include discussions of poetry, religion, a United Nations bill of rights, the good state, as well as philosophical considerations of the social, life, and physical sciences, of logic and theory of value. Although it is unfair to summarize a lengthy and involved exposition such as is found in Northrop's book, the theme of his proposed synthesis is that all forms of judgeable experience depend ultimately for their validity on the concepts of natural science and on the basic logical postulates which underlie the natural sciences. As he writes: "Philosophy

[2]Macmillan, 1948.

of . . . the social sciences and the humanities is a publicly valid one which is also the philosophy of the experimentally verified theory of the natural sciences. In other words, in a properly constructed society the philosophy which underlies the definition of one's economic doctrine, one's political doctrine, one's religious, poetic, and artistic theory must be identical with the philosophy of the natural sciences."

Out of its context this may seem a blunt, even an absurd, pronouncement. In its setting it fits in with Northrop's courageous effort to find a basis of agreement among men. No one can deny that that effort must today be given the utmost priority. Such a basis of agreement cannot be found, his argument points out, unless there is a reduction to some common universe of discourse. Northrop locates such a universe in the area of the fundamental assumptions from which physical science takes its start. He does not have in mind, however, the jejune "reductionism" so prominent in the nineteenth century. That is, no single *method* of science is adequate; each level or stage of problem-solving demands its own technique. (This is, for example, the point of Northrop's severe criticism of Dewey's instrumentalism—that it is a method alleged to apply to all phases of thinking and science.) The reduction here is to *logical postulates,* not to methods, and so Northrop is able to find a place for even speculative philosophy.

To judge the soundness of this argument is not part of the present task. For, despite disagreement on detail, the book is in line with "scientific humanism" in the broadest sense, the sense in which it is being understood throughout this essay, i.e., that man can solve his problems through use of his resources of intelligent inquiry: he does not have to surrender to transcendental power. As in his earlier work, Northrop is concerned with expanding philosophical concepts until they overlap and merge and make synthesis possible. His *Meeting Of East And West* endeavored to show, among other things, that oriental "mysticism" has an empirical and positivistic slant which should bring it into focus with much of western ideology; and that western science is grounded ultimately upon concepts which are immediate and intuitive in a sense familiar to the East. So, in the present book, the analysis of the humanities and of natural science leads him to see the connections enlarged, the ambits merged, and the whole lighted up by a kind of interior philosophic incandescence.

Whatever its handicaps, such an attempt to break down boundaries is of massive importance.

Something of a similar nature is found in the notable work of Professor C. I. Lewis,[3] which was analyzed in a recent issue of the *Review*. Because of this earlier notice and because of the highly technical material of the book, only a paragraph is indicated in this context. But it is a necessary paragraph, since the essence of Lewis's Carus Lectures is precisely the suggested fusion of fact and value judgments; the volume is therefore a significant contribution to naturalism and to humanism. Particularly is it a contribution in the fight against the idea that values are purely matters of emotion and taste and power, and that therefore it is useless to think about them or to choose intelligently between them. "But this is one of the strangest aberrations ever to visit the mind of man," Lewis complains. "Evaluations are a form of empirical knowledge, not fundamentally different in what determines their truth or falsity, and what determines their validity or justification, from other kinds of empirical knowledge." Once more, this is a statement taken out of context, and it certainly is not intended to summarize almost six hundred pages of closely reasoned text. Moreover, as shall be noted presently, Lewis still refuses to carry his analysis over into what he calls "ethics," and it would seem, therefore, that his naturalism is by no means complete. But our intention here is to cite felicitous examples of contemporary thinkers who are holding out against what can only be called metaphysical recidivism. Lewis and Northrop are two of the outstanding American philosophers who are still in there fighting.

* * *

The work of Erich Fromm is now well known.[4] It has shed a happy light in areas formerly given over to gloom, and has suggested that humanism can look for no more powerful allies than among the psychiatrists and psychoanalysts. Even if well known, Fromm's books must be mentioned here as a welcome addition to contemporary humanism, especially interesting because his ideas represent an approach unlike those already considered.

---

[3] *An Analysis Of Knowledge And Valuation*. Open Court, 1946.

[4] *Man For Himself*, Rinehart, 1947. Note also his earlier book, *Escape From Freedom*, Farrar and Rinehart, 1941.

Man For Himself is a prophylactic against the neo-Calvinism of a Niebuhr and the neo-Romanism of a Maritain (also called "humanism" —at least by Maritain). These modern Jeremiahs find man to have original sin, indeed the same sin which Genesis celebrates. Pride in Reason is the clue to all the ills to which man has fallen heir. Man's destructiveness, his sadism, his overturning of all the goods which centuries of "liberalism" have achieved—these are the signs of the inevitable canker at the heart of the rose. Man tries to save himself through unaided reason, and, as Christianity has always shown in an inspired way, such efforts must fail.

Fromm's counterthesis is to the effect that these latterday prophets are substituting symptoms for causes. Man's destructiveness is not some primal taint; it is rather "the outcome of unlived life." It is curable, not innate. What is demanded is not a Savonarola or a Jonathan Edwards but a healer. Fromm's energies as a psychologist are directed to pushing the notions of positive freedom, of spontaneity, of productiveness. There is nothing sentimental about these. As in his earlier book, Fromm is concerned with a substitute for "negative freedom"; he finds that substitute in the spontaneous activity of an integrated personality. "Integrated" is a key word, since it is not simply "intellect" (which the neo-idealists sponsor), nor "soul" or "faith" (which the neo-Christians proffer), nor any other single characteristic that provides the way out of frustration. And frustration, not original sin, is the soil from which spring the hates and greeds and cruelties which have made man so often a depraved brute instead of the son of the gods the poets sing.

Fromm's great contribution to humanism is in the sanity of his interpretation. Man's destructiveness (under which term Fromm groups almost all the negative human factors) is not an indelible mark, or some *Ur*-Demon yielding only to the exorcism of the medicine man. Destructiveness is remediable through psychological understanding and social reconstruction. (Fromm's socialism and psychoanalysis are not divorced.) It is this note of hope—not a guarantee or a promise—that is the very core of humanism.

III

The preceding section presented a few samples from different fields to show that the trend to obscurantism—although a mighty one—is not

yet a rip-tide. But even in these defenders of man there is an Achilles heel, small but fatally vulnerable. It is the separation of facts from morals, of "is" from "ought." A number of quotations taken from three of the writers already considered and from other humanists will pose the problem.

> The dualism of facts and decisions is, I believe, fundamental. Facts as such have no meaning; they can gain it only through our decisions. Historicism is only one of many attempts to get over this dualism. . . . But such an attempt seems to me to represent precisely what is usually described as superstition. [Popper. And in a footnote he adds:] It may be remarked that the world of facts is in itself complete (since every decision can be interpreted as a fact). It is therefore forever impossible to *refute* a monism which insists that there are only facts. But irrefutability is not a virtue. Idealism, for example, cannot be refuted either.[5]

> . . . One cannot get the "ought" or the "good" for a given society from the "is" for that society. When this point is overlooked, an error occurs which certain students of personal ethics term "the naturalistic fallacy" but which we, because problems of value arise in culture rather than in nature, shall term "the culturalistic fallacy." The fallacy . . . consists in applying to normative social theory a scientific procedure which is appropriate only for factual social theory. [Northrop]

> The problem which delimits the field of ethics is not that of the empirically good or valuable but that of the right and morally imperative. . . . Questions of evaluation and those of ethics must be distinguished rather than identified. . . . Questions of values, for any specific mode of valuation, are empirical questions. . . . Valuation is always a matter of empirical knowledge. But what is right and what is just, can never be determined by empirical facts alone. [C. I. Lewis]

> There remains, however, a vast field, traditionally included in philosophy, where scientific methods are inadequate. This field includes ultimate questions of value; science alone, for example, cannot prove that it is bad to enjoy the infliction of cruelty. Whatever can be known, can be known by means of science; but things which are legitimately matters of feeling lie outside its province. [Bertrand Russell]

> Each person who reads this report will want to make interpretations in accordance with his understanding of moral values and social significance; but that is not part of the scientific method and, indeed, scientists have no special capacities for making such evaluations. . . . The social values of

---

[5]Popper is criticizing here, among others, Mannheim and his "sociology of knowledge." In this whole area, Popper seems to be very close to Bertrand Russell.

> human activities must be measured by many scales other than those which are available to the scientist. [The Kinsey Report]
>
> Science can deal only with means. Questions of ends and values are matters of metaphysics. [George Lundberg]

These quotations—all from writers in the general humanistic tradition—form a simple and definite pattern. The last two are particularly revealing for, although coming from scientists, not philosophers, they admit all that the most traditional of metaphysicians would demand. The famed Kinsey Report deals with material of the utmost intimacy and highly "moral" in impact, yet the investigators shy away from making any judgments since they are "only" scientists. The Lundberg opinion is from his challenging *Can Science Save Us?* (1947), a book which is largely a fighting and affirmative answer to its questioning title, and yet he, too, must give over to the "philosopher," to the institutionalized defender and only legitimate interpreter of morals.

The pattern established, even by naturalists, is a clear one: there is no way to get from "is" to "ought." Statements of fact cannot generate judgments of value. Description and interpretation are different *überhaupt*. We can get all the statistical evidence about, say, a government, but that evidence can never help us decide between "Eastern Communism" and "Western Democracy." To give a more vulgar example: "Nicotine is a nasty weed; it blacks the lungs and stains the teeth—I like it." Or, more technically: "ethical naturalism" is untenable. By "ethical naturalism" is meant the belief that all propositions of ethics can be reduced, without remainder, to scientific propositions, e.g., all moral laws can be shown to be functions of psychological and social laws. This kind of total reductionism is frowned upon by almost every contemporary moral theorist, and, apparently, by representative scientists themselves.

The argument, however it be expressed, appears to have eminent plausibility. Philosophy and common sense conspire to give it an almost overwhelming speciousness. Those who do not accept the severance of fact from value are "moral positivists" who will inevitably end by affirming "whatever is is right." But is the argument really as plausible as it sounds? All the men quoted above are "humanists" or "naturalists" in the broad sense in which those words are being understood in this paper. Yet the nose of the alien camel is already in the humanist tent when values are regarded as cut off from facts.

For where are these insulated values to be housed? Clearly two dimensions are proposed in the old familiar manner of the dualist. And all the ancient flyblown problems of interactionism are evoked, if not now between consciousness and matter, then just as unprosperously between facts and decisions. The lessons learned with so much pain seem wasted, and the bootless dichotomies between body and mind, means and ends, cause and effect are all resurrected once facts and values are restrained from sharing the same universe of discourse. In such a situation plausibility is no substitute for effectiveness. If facts inhabit the natural world, as they appear to do, then values (or "ethics" in Lewis's reformulation of the same problem) would have to be exiled to some other world. The temptation to make that "other world" a supernatural one is all but irresistible. A good illustration of such irresistibility is found in the Kinsey Report, which contends, it will be remembered, that scientists can have no traffic with values and morals. Who then determines the morality of the sexual act? Of course, anyone knows the answer to that one, and the Kinsey people are forced to acknowledge it. In Western culture ancient Hebrew prophets and pious Christian monks "have played a dominating part in determining and perpetuating sexual mores." This is precisely the point! When scientists (who presumably have the data) succumb, religious leaders (who have the moral truth) take over. Is this what the scientists of sex encourage?

There is nothing merely technical or facetious in calling attention to this divorce between fact and judgment. Actually the schism between morals and technology is the very diagnosis of man's collapse. This is banal and journalistic, frightening because of its banality. All the maleficent seeds (perhaps, already, the evil blooms) of chaos are prospering in the cracks which now split human experience into fragments. If philosophic humanism has any task at all, it is to help draw together and reduce these tragic dislocations.

The task is a prodigious one—impossible, if many of the leaders of American thought are to be believed; and impossible indeed if values are regarded as unique, as aloof and sanitary. For if morals and technology are ever to be drawn together, one assumption at any rate is imperative: that their respective dimensions do overlap and that the recognized differences between them are of degree not of essence. If such an assumption cannot be granted, then it is clear that, in all the significant

areas of man's life, the scientist must be replaced by the prophet. Humanism becomes untenable, since it rests almost entirely on the premise that man has the power and the potential will to solve his problems, above all his moral problems. The common-sense plausibility, then, of separating data from decisions must carry a massive responsibility, and it is preposterous to suppose that no examination of it is required. A systematic scrutiny is evidently beyond the scope of the present essay, but the point of this section is definitely to transfer the burden of proof where it properly belongs—on the backs of those who put an impassable barrier between what man does and what he ought to do. A few notes may at least indicate how that burden may be shifted.[6]

Take, for instance, the rejection of "ethical (or cultural) naturalism." As noted a few pages back, this rejection is found in the work of almost every moral theorist writing today, even among the most "emancipated." The veto takes several forms. One is simply the frank declaration that the "good," and hence, value, is indefinable. It is a datum, it is not even a legitimate subject of discourse, and it certainly cannot lend itself to the operations of scientific method. A variation of this is the contention that the propositions giving rise to ethics are primitive and elemental ones which cannot be analyzed further. They are *a priori,* at least in a logical sense; that is, they are basic elements and not compounds of anything more simple. For example, just as the sensation of "yellowness" is irreducible—at least as a sensation—and propositions like "this is yellow" cannot be resolved further, so ethical ideas like "justice" and "rightness" are similarly atomic and not derivative, and propositions based on them, e.g., "this is right" or "that is just," are equally unanalyzable. Still another expression of this general attitude is found in the belief that man's feelings and emotions, which are the very core of morals, are quite beyond the bounds of science and even of logic. Thus, the terms and propositions of ethics are largely indefinable, unverifiable, exclamatory in nature, and so literally "meaningless." (The attitudes represented here are found in various schools of contemporary philosophy. "Logical analysis," "logical positivism," "realism" are some of the labels indicated; G. E. Moore and Bertrand Russell, at least two of the names.)

---

[6]In a forthcoming contribution to a symposium on value theory, the present writer has developed this point a little further.

These statements may seem unduly bald, although they are reasonably accurate; yet to challenge them seriously would introduce an excursion into professional philosophy not appropriate for these pages. But at least a few questions may be raised in order to suggest that, despite its sophisticated plausibility, this rather precious contempt for an intelligent ethic is more specious than genuine.

The first kind of question concerns the primitive, unanalyzed propositions on which ethics is alleged to rest. What is the source of these propositions? Are they in no way derived from data; if not, what is their derivation? Are they intuitive in the sense of being inarticulate or in the sense of being above rational experience? In other words, is immaculate conception the only true generation for ethical statements? These are leading, if not loaded, questions. They are intended to point up the essential frustration, the blockage, which any recourse to the ineffable must entail. Not that there are no ineffable experiences, but to ground the judgment of all human conduct on that which is clearly unspeakable suggests an obscurity and fuzziness in which flourishes sentimentalism, if nothing worse. This would be so even if it were granted that the feelings of, say, right or justice, or the sensation of yellowness, were indeed irreducible. Such an assumption, however, begs the very question to which it is addressed. It puts aside in an eminently arbitrary manner the contrary assumptions which would tend to draw together the "inner" and the "outer." This itself is understandable, since one assumption always excludes another; what is not understandable is that this concept of irreducibility is regarded by its formulators not as hypothetical but as a final truth. Yet the whole drift of modern science is to substitute postulates for axioms, hypotheses for absolutes. It is sad that certain sections of contemporary philosophy resist that trend. For example, to insist that experiences like "yellowness" and "rightness" are primitive and in no way amenable to future scientific analysis seems like a familiar kind of philosophic impertinence. It sets up what is at most a common-sense observation (even though it has been refined by generations of epistemologists) as a final dictum, thereby rejecting in advance the changing postulates which an advancing science of life and society will surely demand.

Another group of questions might be directed to the supposed "objectivity" of facts themselves. In the setup proposed by the ethical dualist

a "fact" seems to be self-explanatory just as a "value" does not. Is this not, again, more plausible than profound? Is there any real rupture in the continuum of human decision? Do not facts (even statistical facts, as C. W. Churchman and R. L. Ackoff have pointed out) involve a definite element of selectivity? Is there any such thing as a purely neutral and indifferent datum? Are not values themselves facts of a peculiarly precious character, part of the continuous spectrum of experience? And are not even the hardest facts, those of science, the ones which have proved of particular "value"? These are simply questions, they are not being developed, they settle nothing. Yet they may indicate that, from the obverse as from the reverse, the separation of experience into an unbridgeable "is" and "ought" is a futile and mischievous undertaking.

This matter of somewhat technical philosophy has been introduced to show that humanists themselves are uneasy. Most of them will confess that their philosophy has not yet made a clear place for values and morals, although few of them will admit that this opens the door to idealism and supernaturalism. The contention here is that it does. It should therefore be urged, in conclusion, that every effort of humanistic philosophy, of social and psychological science, must be directed to what is without question the most portentous riddle man has to answer—how to get his actions and his values together. The project is frightening in its complexity, making the puzzles of astronomy or of nuclear physics mere diversions. It must be attacked not in a hortatory fashion (as this paper attacks it . . .) but through painstaking research into details, particularly those of an expanding logic, of psychology and psychiatry, and of anthropology. The details, however, must not obscure the over-all humanistic temper—that man can solve his problems, even the ineffable ones, without recourse to incantation.

Nerve failure is not easily repaired, nor can the retreat from intelligence be halted by a word. Nothing less than a concentrated program enlisting all the creative energies of men and drawing together in a cooperative venture the efforts of science, philosophy, and education, can be expected to reverse the drift to magic. To such a program must philosophic humanism be dedicated, for humanism is not merely another school of thought but a name for man's confidence in himself.

WANDERER'S RETURN

By W. McNEIL LOWRY

I HAVE A BONE TO PICK with the Non-Communist Left. Not, let me say at once, because its members are either non-Communist or left. From Edmund Wilson's *To the Finland Station* to the formation of Americans for Democratic Action, the repudiation of Soviet Communism as a rallying point for American liberals has been not only encouraging to the progressive spirit but a crucial test for the survival of democracy in the western world.

It is not too much to say that the postwar work American liberals have done in stripping from the Soviet myth its carefully fabricated vestments of "democracy" and "democratic co-operation" has been indispensable to both the policy and the security of the United States. Many of those now talking about the Non-Communist Left by no means waited until the war's end to do battle with Soviet apologists. None was so scarifying about the menace of Communist totalitarianism as the American Marxist who went off with Trotsky or took alarm over the Moscow trials of 1937-38. There is something peculiarly exhilarating about American democrats and American democracy in a period when the deliberate perversion of democratic symbols is being ruthlessly tracked down and exposed.

My complaints about the Non-Communist Left, or rather about those who invented it, are that while many of them have given over Marx and all of them have given over Marx's betrayers in the Soviet Union, they have not given over the ideological habit of mind which carried them to Marx originally; they now split the "left" of which they are a part, and

---

As chief correspondent for the Cox newspapers, W. McNEIL LOWRY was responsible for "breaking" the story of the drive of the Slaughter-grain trade lobby against the farmers—a drive which, when it had been reported, did more to elect President Truman and a strongly Democratic Congress than any other single action of the campaign. Mr. Lowry was at one time an editor of *Accent: a Quarterly of New Literature* published at the University of Illinois.

they claim as the special possession of an intellectual coterie the indigenous spirit of radical democracy in the United States.

After spending the '20's or '30's or both in strange postures, the proclaimed leaders of the Non-Communist Left have come back to the reservation, but with the firm purpose of staking out their own sole claim to the ground a lot of liberals, intellectuals or otherwise, never left. And "Keep Off the Grass" signs have been going up all over the place.

For a case in point. Writing in the New York *Times Book Review* last June (June 6, 1948), Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. does an excellent job of taking Harold J. Laski apart for the "intellectual confusion" of the latter's book, *The American Democracy*.

Laski, Mr. Schlesinger says, is committed ideologically to a view of the United States as "of a monstrous capitalist colossus, monolithic in its structure, irrevocable in its purpose, dedicated to the triumph of finance capital throughout the world." And yet, he continues, "The image of the United States which emerges from the concrete passages of *The American Democracy* is of a great, rich and various nation, multifarious in its possibilities, vigorous in its democratic traditions, almost protected by its history and its native diversities from any descent into a closed society."

What is the reason for Mr. Laski's confusion, according to Mr. Schlesinger? Simply this: "The moral and political urgencies which have given rise in the last decade to the enormously revivifying conception of the Non-Communist Left are altogether absent from Laski."

That is where the NCL boys are a little maddening. "The last decade" would take us back to 1938, when American liberals, following those who had already sided with Trotsky, were falling from the Soviet bandwagon owing to the revelations of the Moscow trials. It would include, a year or two later, the more stubborn American Marxists who jumped into the snows of Finland or felt the jolt of the Russo-German pact.

But there were other American liberals, in great numbers, who found plenty of "moral and political urgencies" in the '20's and '30's without becoming either Marxists or Soviet apologists. And to interpret them they used not Lenin or Trotsky, but Jefferson and Jackson, the very people, in short, whom Mr. Schlesinger and other proclaimers of the Non-Communist Left have so brilliantly revaluated in the past five years.

Coming back to 1948, these other American liberals have also found the conception of the Non-Communist Left "enormously revivifying,"

but as something necessary to bring their errant brothers safely back into the democratic fold, into an alliance which *can* prove enormously effective in both protecting and extending the tradition of radical American democracy. Their worry, however, is that the coterie spirit, the same intellectual snobbery which American Marxists of the '30's showed toward their less ideological brothers, may make that alliance less effective than it might be. For the liberal, intellectual or otherwise, who stayed at home while the NCL travellers were on their Marxian wanderings, does not like to be put outside the pale because he did not take even the short tour.

It is true that Mr. Schlesinger (he is being singled out only because he has constantly defined the idea of the Non-Communist Left) some months ago wrote an article in the New York *Times Magazine* in which he welcomed into the fold almost every anti-Communist American from Walter Reuther to Averell Harriman. But the suggestion persists that a liberal must either have loved or encompassed the Marxist ideology, even if of the non-Stalinist variety, before he can have (a) spurned it or (b) remained a liberal.

In a narrow sense, of course, the point is well taken, at least for the liberal intellectual. He can not have gone through the depression and the '30's and remained oblivious to the significance of the Russian Revolution, any more than an enlightened American liberal of 1789 could have ignored the French Revolution.

But in a general sense the suggestion is not well taken and may be both arrogant and complacent. There were, certainly, many American liberals of the '30's who, without knowing the precise differences among Stalinites, Trotskyites, Lovestoneites, and so on, knew enough about the general principles of Marx and Lenin to believe them poor assumptions on which to erect a democratic society. Marx's view of capitalism may have been highly useful in interpreting the depression; his view of the state furnished no method by which Americans could both solve the depression and preserve personal and civil liberties.

These were the American intellectuals who, in the Babbitt era, were devastatingly critical of popular American art, popular American literature, popular American social mores, but not popular American democracy. They were critical of the excesses of American capital, bitterly critical of many of the products of the American system of government, but

no more so, and often much less, than many Americans, intellectuals or popular rank and file, had been of the same evils in earlier days.

These were the American liberals who were almost guiltless of ideologies, and they voted for Roosevelt without worrying too much about the inconsistencies in that leader's concepts of the state. They voted for Roosevelt as, in an earlier time, their fathers voted for Wilson, for Bryan, for T. R., yes, even for the Populists. And they did not need any concept of the "popular front" to vote for Roosevelt, either.

At the moment, this unbuttoned variety of the American liberal is more confident of issues than of men. But here too he is more likely to trust politics as the art of the possible than is the "enormously revified" member of the Non-Communist Left. The latter's flirtations with General Eisenhower, whose career has been so little ideological that his stand on all but one or two major issues of our time remains a mystery, had something both amateurish and embarrassing about them.

The split within the Democratic Party (to take an example of the native American "left" which, by its ideological looseness, is horrifying to the NCL) was inevitable long before President Truman's civil rights message and the wavering policy toward Palestine. The varying special interests, economic and political, in the coalition behind Roosevelt could not be held together for long.

Roosevelt himself held them together long enough to use them as a powerful compulsion both to retain his administration and to give it the legislative authority needed to advance its goals. But even Roosevelt had to compromise some of his goals, or see them lost, through the clashing interests represented within Democratic ranks.

The Non-Communist Left saw the rips in the Democratic Party fabric long before Mr. Truman's troubles became acute. Its most highly organized political instrument, Americans for Democratic Action, laid its strategy accordingly: If radical (non-Communist) American democracy was to solidify its power, it could only be by a pendulum swing of what was left of the Democratic party in the North and the West, aided by the non-Communist labor unions. It would be 1952 or later before labor could readjust its perspective and the Republican-controlled Congress be sufficiently tested to permit a liberal comeback. In the meantime, ADA should maintain the closest contact with the Democratic

Party of the North and the West in order to use the vehicle in 1952 or 1956.

Purely as strategy, without regard to its service to the country, this plan could have been effective only if followed out in toto. When first Henry Wallace and then the more affronted southerners began deserting the Democratic Party and Mr. Truman, ADA, by virtue merely of its own previously laid strategy, should have cleaved to both, even if the Democrats faced certain defeat, or especially if they faced defeat. Instead many of ADA's most influential members began to look to General Eisenhower as a candidate who could "unite the party," in this case the southern opponents of the civil rights program and the northern liberals who helped to fashion it.

Even if one takes the prime issue which the Non-Communist Left so brilliantly illuminates, the struggle between democracy and Communism for the world's allegiance, there are points at which the less ideological American liberal becomes a little embarrassed by the enthusiasm of the returnees.

When compared to those who never saw the democratic millenium in either Marxism or Russia, the leftists asserting their non-Communism have in some instances been a little less than choicy about their anti-Russian allies. They have been consistent in hostility toward the totalitarians, left or right, and in this have helped to counteract the zeal of many Americans who would use Franco or a resurgent Germany of any political character against the Communists. But they have paid visits to other shrines which might not have met the test of confident, if unsophisticated liberals in the American tradition.

The New Leader, which helped to give voice to the non-Communist left before the latter became a thing, has for many years exposed Russia's hand and the menace of Stalinist Communism wherever it could. Springing from a definite schism in modern "social democratic" thought, the publication has escaped many twists and turns which have plagued such a better-known liberal weekly as *The New Republic.*

In the past two years, however, the editors of *The New Leader,* in the fight against Russian Communism, have been assaying the contributions made by (to take separate examples) General De Gaulle in France and John Foster Dulles in the United States. It may prove to be true that De Gaulle has caused the Communists in France as much trouble as he

has caused both M. Bidault and the Socialists. But even Republican congressmen who have investigated conditions in France believe that De Gaulle may yet prejudice Marshall plan operations in that country. Mr. Dulles has had an important influence on American policies abroad, and his testimony on Germany helped get the European recovery program through Congress, but his economic ideas appear to many American liberals little different from those Speaker Martin, Majority Leader Halleck, and Representative Harold Knutson manifested toward the reciprocal trade program during the latter days of the Eightieth Congress.

Anti-Communism does not divide American liberals, or differentiate among them, unless one includes Henry Wallace's followers among American liberals and thus makes the term meaningless. The point is that there exists an older and richer touchstone of American liberalism than that of anti-Communism. It is a touchstone which proclaimers of the Non-Communist Left are brilliantly rediscovering and shining into new luster, and they have found it deep in the American political past. The process of rediscovery has been heartwarming even to the onlookers.

But some of these onlookers, the non-Marxist American liberals who grew to maturity in the '30's, felt sufficiently out of things in those days when not to be a Marxist was considered somewhat queer. They don't want to be left out again, particularly when it means being deprived of the radical American democracy which never ceased to satisfy them. They don't want positive American liberalism to be defined in a phrase beginning with a negative.

My quarrel with the Non-Communist Left is that the left is split enough in this country without splitting it further. Welcome home, NCL; you do look enormously revivified. But now that you're back on the reservation, please stop putting a fence around it.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

By PETER KIHSS

THE PEOPLE OF WESTERN SAMOA are a sturdy race, and a thriving one. For nearly fifty years they have lived under foreign rule—first the empire of Kaiser Germany, then international tutelage through a mandate and trusteeship assigned to New Zealand. They deem themselves once again ripe for self-government.

A United Nations mission went out to those volcano-born tropical isles, sunning inside their coral reefs, and it found much—not quite all—in their favor. It recommended specific increases in home rule. And it set forth a philosophy:

> Even a limited degree of self-government involves risks which are not underestimated by the mission. But these risks must be taken. The only way to promote education in self-government is to put political responsibility into the hands of the people to a degree where they can learn.
>
> Training in self-government can come only through actual experience, sometimes costly.

Training in international organization is also something that can come only through actual experience, and the United Nations has been trying, sometimes well. It has failed on many occasions, when perhaps there would have been no need for failure, had there been more daring. But so long as the UN keeps trying, it is worth the effort. The cost, incidentally, for the UN and all its specialized agencies runs about $225,000,000 a year, or ten cents a year for each of the world's inhabitants, or one one-thousandth the annual military and property damage costs of World War II. Even this cost is made up—two-thirds of it—primarily by the job of the International Refugee Organization, caring for the war's displaced persons.

For PETER KIHSS, veteran of fifteen years newspaper experience on varied assignments, this article is a kind of personal valedictory on the United Nations uncontemplated at the time the article was written. Mr. Kihss has been recalled to general assignment by the *New York Herald Tribune,* for which paper he covered the UN from January, 1946 till the past month.

UN failures have been widely noted. For a change, how about some of its achievements? The coin has two sides, and it doesn't always come up tails.

The UN has two basic reasons for existence. One is emergency—to keep the peace. The other is long-range—to try to build a better world, so no one will need to break the peace to seek his reasonable due. In ten trust territories, for example, 15,000,000 people are travelling on the road toward a freedom goal in the UN way—a way of progress through peace, rather than the traditional pike of bloodshed and revolt.

In Western Samoa, the Trusteeship Council worked out a new program in co-operation with New Zealand—a new administration, with a top council comprising a New Zealand commissioner and a native representative; a legislative assembly, with native majority; certain powers—external relations, defense, currency—reserved to New Zealand.

In West Africa, 1,000,000 Ewes, black natives growing in tribal consciousness, protested the policies which had partitioned them among British and French Togolands trust territories and Britain's Gold Coast colony. The Trusteeship Council heard the grievances from one of their number, Sylvanus Olympio, testifying in person at Lake Success.

Out of it all, Britain and France offered a pledge of joint economic, fiscal, and cultural measures to ease the difficulties, watched over by a joint consultative commission with native representation. The council called this an "initial" effort, and asked further Anglo-French action and reports.

The more the council has worked, the more willing it has become to bring increasingly sharp moral opinion on the administrations of the trust nations. Investigating the first reports from other territories, it came through with these admonitions:

1. To Belgium, it declared the progress by Ruanda-Urundi natives in democracy was "disappointing"; that "economic benefits were not sufficiently directed to the interests of the indigenous population"; that prevalence of illiteracy and leaving of education almost entirely to missions revealed "inadequacy of . . . initiative." It recommended at least a preliminary form of electoral system, government changes, more schooling and services generally.

2. To Australia, it expressed doubts that a projected administrative union between New Guinea trust territory and Papua would preserve

identity of New Guinea and enable its charter advancement; declared the minimum wage of fifteen shillings a month "inadequate"; called for urgent improvements in medical service; voiced "concern at the inadequacy of educational facilities in the territory and at the consequently high rate of illiteracy, which is hindering the political advancement of the indigenous inhabitants."

3. To Great Britain, it refused sanction, pending further study, of the Inter-Territorial Organization between Tanganyika trust territory and Britain's own Kenya and Uganda, noting this had been put into effect without prior consultation with UN. It called for electoral reform and asserted "the now existing tribal structure is an obstacle to the political and social advancement of the indigenous inhabitants." It called attention to "the disparity in expenditure and educational facilities for European, Asian and African children respectively," and asked "measures to improve the standard of life by increasing substantially the wage level of the indigenous inhabitants, particularly in large corporations in industrial districts and in plantations."

South Africa has refused to submit the old Southwest Africa mandate for UN trusteeship, and the council submitted a highly critical report for Assembly action. The natives, it said, had "no franchise, no eligibility to office and no representation in the governing bodies or in the administration of the territory." The budget devotes little more than 10 per cent to the natives, who make up 90 per cent of the people. The system of racial segregation was condemned, and the council noted no educational facilities at all were provided in the purely native areas.

But perhaps all this deals with relatively simple issues, and perhaps the same might be said of the UN's increasingly penetrating, although still mild, scrutiny of the affairs of the world's other non-self-governing territories, those on which eight colonial powers annually report to the Assembly on economic, social, and educational conditions of 200,000,000 people.

What about the tangled webs into which the so-called civilized nations have been woven by the spinners of politics, the rival designs of centuries? The UN has made advances in their economic and social problems, too, to the end that their peoples may have more bread, and on occasion butter to spread over it.

The Economic and Social Council, another charter organ, studied the woes of war-devastated areas, and out of this eventually grew the UN Economic Commission for Europe. The ECE took over co-ordination and allocation work previously done by wartime Allied agencies, and spread out on its own. In it, Eastern Europe worked jointly with Western Europe and the United States. Its committees and working parties spotlighted fundamental and bottleneck problems. They've done something about them:

1. Coal allocations were worked out and enabled an increase, based on production figures for the third and fourth quarters of 1947, of 18,000 tons in European nitrogen output, corresponding to a potential increase of 220,000 tons in wheat crops.

2. Experts found delivery of equipment scheduled for reparations from Germany could increase ball-bearing output by 3,600,000 units in France, 1,500,000 in Czechoslovakia, and American occupation authorities in Germany undertook to act accordingly.

3. Working parties pointed out production of heat- and corrosion-resistant silica bricks, essential in steel, coke, cement and glass industries, could be increased by transferring Italian skilled labor to quartzite mines in the French zone of Germany, sending earth-moving equipment from the American to the French and British zones, and improving transport of coal and other equipment. The continent went on to boost 1948 production 26 per cent above 1947.

4. Negotiations restored international regulations on reciprocal use of freight cars in international railroad traffic through the greater part of Europe. One working party found certain countries had held on to cars so long that a shortage of 18,000 cars in the British and American zones of Germany was "seriously restricting the movement of coal from the Ruhr." Agreements to pay back the cars slashed the deficit from December, 1947, to 5,000, by April, 1948.

5. Eleven countries—Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom—and the three western zones of Germany all undertook to grant or maintain for 1948 freedom of transit for road transport of goods, with Czechoslovakia joining in for a six-month test. Seven of these, with Hungary added, and the three German zones have already agreed to extend this through 1949.

6. ECE's electric power committee helped facilitate agreements for exchange of electricity among Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland; and among the occupation authorities in Germany and Austria, Belgium and Switzerland; and began preparatory work on co-ordinated development of European power resources.

7. ECE timber experts, working with those of the Food and Agriculture Organization, obtained agreements to restrain competitive buying and to increase production, citing Germany as a cause of forest depletion in formerly occupied countries and a source for well-managed cutting of timber. The recommendations were fulfilled; Europe's 1946 imports of sawn softwood had been 1,725,000 standards, and in 1947, European importers were able to get 2,775,000, a 61 per cent rise. Plans to boost Eastern Europe's exports some 400,000 standards to Western Europe during 1948, depending on credits for equipment, were the next move.

8. Commission revisions of coal allocations were expected to increase European steel production 400,000 tons in the second quarter of 1948, as the continent drove to regain its prewar output.

9. Commission efforts led to an agreement whereby Italy made available several million dollars' worth of automotive spare parts to Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia in exchange for raw materials, rather than demanding hard currency. This enabled continued or renewed operation of 60,000 motor vehicles.

The Economic and Social Council has set up similar regional commissions to work on development of Latin America and the Far East, and is still planning one for the Middle East. It has further set up a Commission on Narcotic Drugs, taking over League of Nations control work in that field, and has eight other functional commissions engaged on problems of economics and employment, transport and communications, statistics, fiscal affairs, population, social issues, human rights, and the status of women.

Down-to-earth work is being carried on elsewhere by thirteen specialized agencies with present or pending links to the UN:

1. The International Labor Organization, working since League of Nations days, recently started an international employment information service in Europe, which turned up 103,775 jobs available for foreign workers in six European countries immediately, 330,500 for the coming year.

2. The Food and Agriculture Organization tackled the situation which has found half the world's people—a thousand million—ill-fed or even below the daily minimum subsistence diet of prewar days (2,250 calories). For the postwar emergency, it continued wartime recommendations for allocations in international trade—work on cereals, cocoa, fats, oils, feeds, nitrogenous fertilizer, and rice still going on; discontinued now in fifteen other commodities. It has fought waste with education, demonstrations, and specific missions, and battled diseases by such means as spreading the Canadian-American avianized rinderpest vaccine, a discovery of bacteriological warfare science, into Asia and Africa. It has moved toward building up food output for the world's growing population by disseminating hybrid corn seeds in Europe and the Middle East; aiding the Arab states in irrigation and conservation; mapping out detailed programs to double production in Greece and Poland.

3. The UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization prepared a "Book of Needs" for war-devastated European and Asiatic countries, and started supplying books, materials, equipment, and fellowships from its own funds, co-ordinating efforts of voluntary organizations which have raised $150,000,000 for such aid in the United States alone. It launched pilot projects on fundamental education in Nyasaland and Haiti, interrupted temporarily by malaria in the latter. It set up an International Hylean Amazon Institute for research and development efforts in the green heart of South America.

4. The International Civil Aviation Organization, its members operating more than 90 per cent of the world's international air transport, has been drawing up standards and recommended practices which take effect on set dates in 1949 unless a majority of members register actual disapproval. The first five covered personnel licensing, aeronautical maps and charts, rules of the air, dimensional practices, and meteorological codes. Twenty nations have signed the convention on legal rights in aircraft. Ten nations joined in contributing to a network of thirteen weather stations, each with two or three ships, across the North Atlantic. Ten nations arranged through ICAO for joint support of the $600,000-a-year air navigation facilities on Iceland. Twenty-two accepted standardized clearance for customs airports, with twelve more promising to do so soon.

5. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development made loans of $250,000,000 to France, $195,000,000 to the Netherlands,

$40,000,000 to Denmark, $12,000,000 to Luxembourg and $12,000,000 to four Dutch shipping lines, and development loans of $16,000,000 to Chilean government corporations. Total: $525,000,000, with discussions going on over projects in more than twenty other nations.

6. The International Monetary Fund has sold nearly $640,000,000 in Belgian francs, British sterling, and American dollars to a dozen countries needing foreign exchange. Its missions have gone into thirty countries, practically all of which then undertook budget reforms, credit controls, and exchange actions in accordance with IMF recommendations.

7. The World Health Organization, taking up UN Relief and Rehabilitation Administration work, fought malaria in Greece, and in three years the toll went down from 1,000,000 cases a year to 50,000. When a cholera epidemic struck Egypt, WHO mobilized more than 4,000,000 cubic centimeters of vaccine, more than two-thirds of the total aid received by Egypt from fourteen nations. The epidemic was controlled within six weeks, although it had started with more than a thousand new cases a day. Ethiopia had not a single local doctor or nurse for 12,000,000 people; a WHO medical mission trained eighty nurses in its first year, and hoped to have enough dressers and sanitary officers to meet the basic needs by 1949.

WHO distributed new research results—for instance, a German technique of chemically dehydrating pancreas glands, which has already doubled German insulin output; use of DDT and live vaccine to fight plague; sulfa drugs and streptomycin against trachoma, an Indian vaccine against cholera. WHO fellowships have trained students, and disease-warning services have been set up from Geneva and a dozen broadcasting stations in the Far East.

8. The International Refugee Organization, in its first year, repatriated 51,000 refugees, resettled 205,000 more in seventy-three countries, with 598,445 still receiving care in its camps and 108,000 receiving legal protection and other aid. Hopes were to resettle 380,000 more in the second year, through June 30, 1949.

9. The International Trade Organization's preparatory committee in Geneva brought about a 22-nation General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, reducing or binding tariff rates on more than 45,000 items. The same nations have agreed to engage in further tariff negotiations, which will involve altogether thirty-four countries.

10. The Universal Postal Union, descended from the 1863 General Postal Union, continued reciprocal exchange of mail arrangements among nations, being available to render opinions in case of disputes.

11. The International Telecommunications Union, descendant of the 1865 International Telegraph Union, established new frequency allocations for the long and medium wave radio field, and started work to bring order out of war-caused chaos in short-wave broadcasting.

12. The Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, still an interim committee, was set up on Economic and Social Council initiative, to handle technical shipping problems, including safety, and to seek removal of discriminations and unnecessary restrictions.

13. The World Meteorological Organization started a transformation from the old International Meteorological Organization, a semi-official agency since 1878, into an intergovernmental body in 1947, to promote networks of weather stations, encourage exchange of weather information, and seek standardization in its field.

Beyond these, the International Children's Emergency Fund, operating since November, 1947, under the Economic and Social Council, has raised some $100,000,000 from governments, UNRRA assets and private contributions, and has carried on supplemental feeding of some 4,500,000 children and pregnant and nursing mothers in a dozen European countries and China. With WHO, it has launched the world's largest immunization program—to examine 50,000,000 European children, and to vaccinate an estimated tuberculosis-free 15,000,000 of these against the white plague.

The UN Appeal for Children collected some $25,000,000 from individuals in fifty countries and twenty-eight non-self-governing territories, of which some $15,000,000 was to go to the children's fund and the rest to similar projects by the nations themselves. And in another relief venture, the UN mediation mission in Palestine rallied nearly a score of countries for emergency aid to some 500,000 Arab and Jewish refugee victims of the Holy Land strife.

These are the things of which peace can be built, given time. These are the things that are often overlooked while the likewise essential job of keeping the peace in emergencies goes on.

But the UN has had some achievements in peace-keeping, as well. In its first case, which might perhaps have been handled more deftly, the

Security Council ventilated the Soviet-Iranian dispute, and the Soviet Union evacuated its troops from that Middle East crossroads. In complaints brought by Syria and Lebanon, Britain and France announced their respect for majority opinion, even though the Soviet Union, seeking stronger action, had vetoed a council resolution; they thereafter withdrew their troops from those two countries.

When two British destroyers struck mines in Corfu Channel, and lost forty-four sailors killed and forty-two wounded in October, 1946, it was the kind of dispute which, in other times, has led to war. The Security Council was blocked by Soviet veto from pronouncing judgment against Albania. Great Britain then took the case to the International Court of Justice, on council suggestion. There, all fifteen judges, Slavs and the rest, unanimously upheld court jurisdiction, over Albanian protest, and the machinery was started for drawn-out hearings, with both sides agreeing to comply.

In Indonesia, colonial warfare was stopped after months of effort by a January, 1948, truce and preliminary political agreement attained by a Security Council good offices committee. Thirty-five thousand republican troops were evacuated from behind Dutch lines; demilitarized zones were set up, and further negotiations launched.

In the embroiled Balkans, a Security Council commission first and an Assembly committee thereafter kept watch over frontier incidents in the Greek guerrilla strife, and the conflict was at least kept from flaring into outright international war.

In Palestine, large-scale war was choked off first for four weeks by UN mediation. It was renewed, and then stopped again under threat of Security Council sanctions. A solution remained for the future, but at least thousands of lives had been spared during those periods while efforts went on to stabilize the situation.

In Korea, an Assembly commission observed elections in the southern region at least, leading to launching of a Korean government in Seoul, as a result of which the United States gave up its military governorship in favor of the new republic. Assembly observers were left to watch developments, as the Soviet-inspired north refused co-operation.

At a time when rival ideologies struggle for the minds of men, the UN has politically provided a world forum for the presentation of views —and demonstration of good faith—on many an issue which has dead-

locked. On atomic energy, for instance, during 1946, 1947 and 1948, fourteen of seventeen nations on the UN Atomic Energy Commission studied out the technological facts. They came to agree on a plan for UN operation of dangerous atomic facilities, a proposal first sponsored by the United States. The Assembly likewise gave overwhelming approval to the principles of the majority plan, and the Soviet Union stood isolated with its group in opposition to the moral opinion of the rest of the world, blocking agreement.

Given the observant eye of the world assembled in UN, nations have found it needful to conform their actions to perhaps better courses than might otherwise have been taken. The United States, first announcing the Truman doctrine to aid Greece and Turkey against aggressive communism, decided to inform the Security Council that it sought an opportunity for those nations to choose their own futures. India and Pakistan, disputing over Kashmir and other issues, let the fight be carried on in the guise of provincial strife, rather than burst out in outright international war.

For a nation which disrupts the international peace can now be branded before a standing body of its peers, and so it is likely to do considerable thinking before it chooses such a course which may find it facing the rest of the world community united against it. And while it contemplates that possibility, there is always the time and the opportunity for the UN and its members to try to do better.

There are ways of surmounting problems, and the UN has already found some. It was a minority Polish-British-American proposal, originally opposed by the Soviet Union, which went from the Economic and Social Council in a report to the Assembly, and the Assembly eventually unanimously approved the plan for the effective Economic Commission for Europe.

When the United States and United Kingdom opposed further extension of UNRRA and favored bilateral arrangements for relief, the Assembly worked out a co-ordinating scheme by which a ten-nation UN committee of experts surveyed needs, and UN then informed well-to-do nations about them. And the Assembly established the ICEF and the IRO for separate phases of the international problem.

There are things that still should be done, and can be done. A military arm, one of the original charter objectives, has never come into being

because of deadlocks among the five great powers in the secretive Military Staff Committee. Smaller nations could well demand that the Big Five publish their varying ideas on the specific strength of such forces—rather than the well-known argument over the principle of equal or equivalent contributions from the major powers. The nations are likely then to find that even the minimum over-all proposals on actual numbers of planes, ships, and ground contingents, those of the Soviet Union, would have provided forces more than adequate to combat the peace breaches in Indonesia, in Palestine, in Kashmir. Such special forces could at least be a beginning.

Confronted with vetoes frustrating Security Council action, the UN can broaden the sphere of the Assembly, and keep the Assembly's interim committee—the so-called Little Assembly, on which all fifty-eight members are entitled to serve—in being the year around. The Little Assembly could then watch world developments, and represent a rallying point in emergencies.

The Little Assembly has already suggested means of easing the veto by Big Five consultations, and advocated agreement on broad charter interpretations to allow any seven-nation Security Council majority to adopt resolutions in cases involving peaceful settlements or membership applications. It was broad constructions which made the United States Constitution a living document, rather than a stumbling block of rigidity.

Nations can unite their strength within the UN framework even for military action, without threat of frustrating Security Council veto. In Article 51, the charter specifically authorizes individual or "collective" self-defense in a breach of the peace, until such time as the Council can act. Such "collective" arrangements, regional arrangements, might be brought into wider being, as a sign that the UN peoples stand determined to resist and remove the scourge of war.

The UN might have done better, but it is still the one place where all the great powers, and most of the other nations of the world, meet. It is still the place where they can learn to live together. It is still the best single means for trying to keep the peace, and build a better world.

There was once a UN chauffeur named Ole Helge Bakke. He volunteered to go with fifty other unarmed UN men to Palestine to serve as guards in the first four-week UN truce there. On July 13, he died before

a sniper's bullet on ostensibly demilitarized Mount Scopus in Jerusalem, the city where Jesus Christ also gave up his life.

The sun shone the day they buried him in Brooklyn, and outside the Norwegian Seamen's Church, children tossed balls on a chalked-up street. A man sold vegetables from a pushcart drawn by a tired horse, and cheerful motorists roared their cars down Clinton Street. It was the kind of world which the UN had sought to keep in peace, and David B. Vaughan, as the officer in charge of Lake Success headquarters, pronounced a memorial.

He said Ole Helge Bakke had believed in peace—"believed in it enough to risk his very life to preserve it." Bakke had not been a statesman or a man of wealth. "But very often," the UN chief declared, "great events in history have not been the result of a single man's endeavors, but rather the sum total of the individual efforts of many people. Thus, in a sense, the United Nations was the result of the desire of the peoples of the world to establish a world body capable of maintaining peace and restoring faith in basic human values, in decency and respect for human dignity and justice."

The UN accomplishes what the peoples everywhere want it to accomplish, and let it do. The moral is still the one the UN itself preached in the case of Western Samoa—responsibility in the hands of the people, and learning by actual experience, sometimes costly. But if the people lose heart and lose faith, the UN will likewise be lost—and in an atomic age, it may well be lost with all its peoples.

WRITING IN THE USSR

By ROBERT MAGIDOFF

THE STATE OF Soviet literature is as sorrowful as the state of art, the theatre, or the cinema. And it is so despite the fact that the Soviet reading public is probably the largest in the world, and certainly the most eager.

While one is exposing the Bolsheviks for relentlessly disturbing and crippling literary tastes, one must also give them credit for converting old backward, almost illiterate Russia into a nation of avid readers. When the Bolsheviks came to power, less than one third of the population could read and write. I recall a poster, one of the first to appear after the revolution of 1917, which showed a little boy struggling with his homework and saying: "Oh, mother, I wish you could read and write. I need your help so much." Between 1919 and 1922, five million adults fulfilled the boy's wish. In 1926 there were twice as many literates in Russia as in 1897, but even then the percentage of literates among army recruits and marrying couples was 87.7 among men and 46.2 per cent among women. In 1939, 81.2 per cent of all persons in the Soviet Union were literate. The percentage is even higher now.

The number of libraries reached in 1939 a record of 77,590, including 61,700 libraries in rural communities.

The above figures bear witness to a veritable cultural revolution. It has created an insatiable market for books. Their number has been growing in arithmetical progression, the demand in geometrical. To satisfy that demand, to push along and control the knowledge, tastes, and thinking of the Soviet peoples, the government has created a vast network of publishing houses, the running of which is a managerial nightmare due to shortages of metals for type, printing equipment, paper, and skilled labor. It is also a job pregnant with danger, since a mistake in the selection of a book, the timing of its publication or size of edition may lead

---

Guilty of a knowledge of both the United States and the Soviet Union, NBC correspondent ROBERT MAGIDOFF was forced to leave the USSR last April. This is a brief section of a book to be published in February by Doubleday, *In Anger and Pity*.

to grave consequences. I know of at least a half dozen heads of Soviet publishing houses who have been purged for just such "mistakes."

In line with Stalin's dictum that "the printed word is the sharpest and most powerful weapon of the Communist Party," the party keeps Soviet publishing under the strictest control. The Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, headed by Suslov who was held responsible directly to Politburo member, the late Andrei Zhdanov, has set up an organization which censors everything intended for publication. Commonly known as Glavlit, its full name is the Central Administration on Literary and Publishing Matters. The Propaganda Department appoints the director and editor-in-chief of each publishing house, holding them responsible for the fulfillment of the plan by their respective house, and, above all, for the ideology expressed in the books they are putting out.

When S. A. Lozovsky, director of the leading Soviet publishing house of fiction and poetry, the Gosizdat, was appointed vice-minister of foreign affairs, in charge of the Far Eastern Division, he found the treacherous Japanese and the devious Chinese easier to handle than Glavlit. Even the indomitable foreign correspondents, with whom he exchanged witty, sarcastic, and downright angry remarks during his famous wartime press conferences, were to him just naughty boys compared to the Glavlit doctrinaires.

Like the director and editor-in-chief, Glavlit censors are held responsible for the ideological deviations, inconsistencies, and praise of the West, no matter how timid and indirect. Their major weapon of self-protection is proscrastination, a weapon they share with all Soviet bureaucrats. A manuscript is delayed by the publishing house reader who finally writes a report usually so full of buts and howevers that it is handed over to a more experienced man, preferably a Communist Party member. He, too, prefers not to shoulder responsibility, and the manuscript finally lands in the laps of the editor-in-chief and the director, both of whom must be Party members. After the book is accepted and set up, proofs are made, corrected and sent to Glavlit. Each copy of every book must have in the back the word "Glavlit" followed by the number of a permit. Behind that number stands a man, his signature. The signature is hard to get, hard to give. It spells responsibility. It, therefore, spells procrastination. In the meantime, the manager of the printing plant, who has production

deadlines of his own, does not let the director of the publishing house rest. The latter is frantic and helpless. He pleads for time. But there is a shortage of metal, and the manager of the printing shop has the authority to seize the type and melt it down to meet the constant rush of other orders. On most occasions, as soon as a book comes off the press, the plates are melted.

This constant three-way tug-of-war is one of the reasons for the Soviet indulgence in the publication of universally recognized classics of world and Russian literature. Most of them, fortunately, live up even to the unstable Soviet definitions of progressivism, culture, and democracy, especially since long-winded introductions, footnotes, and postscripts take care of the ideological "mistakes" a Shakespeare, Goethe, Balzac, or Tolstoy might have committed from the point of view of the current curve in the Party Line.

In addition to the titans of world literature, the current Kremlin favorites are also a godsend to Soviet publishers. The moment an author is praised by *Pravda* and *Culture and Life,* both organs of the Central Committee of the ruling Communist Party, or by the *Literary Gazette,* organ of the Writers Union, which of late has become militant and authoritative on Stalin's personal instructions, then all procrastination in connection with his books ends. They begin to appear in record time by the hundreds of thousands of copies. The same results are achieved if an author gets the coveted Stalin Prize or, the secret dream of every Soviet writer, a congratulatory telephone call from Stalin himself.

Joseph Stalin has always kept an eagle eye on literature, finding time not only to read the major works of Soviet men of letters, but also to receive groups of authors for lengthy discussions and to contact individuals, often by telephone in the middle of the night to congratulate them on a new book, or to give encouragement and detailed advice. Among the recipients of such telephone calls are the novelist and publicist, Ilya Ehrenburg, the writer of fiction, and playwright Leonid Leonov, and Vadim Kozhevnikov, author of the finest long short story of the war, "March-April," written in the Jack London manner. These calls are not without their humor and pathos. Trying to contact a woman writer, Antonovskaya, to congratulate her on the manuscript of her historical novel about Georgia, Stalin's birthplace, he got her out of bed in the middle of the night. Now, the telephone was not in her room, but

in the hall of the apartment which she shared with several other families in the usual Moscow tradition. The ringing of the phone woke up some of the other people in the apartment who could not fall asleep again since the conversation was long and the voice of the excited authoress was high pitched. Stalin was trying to give her pointers on the history of Georgia, and she tried to make hay while the sun shone and voiced complaints against the bureaucrats in the Glavlit and the publishing house who were sabotaging her book. Doors began to open and angry voices of sleepy men and women began to clamor for silence. "But this is Stalin," she shouted at them exultantly, without taking the necessary precautions. When Stalin inquired about the noise and the sudden exclamation, she explained the reason. Next day a telephone was installed in her room. There have been no more calls from the Kremlin, but her book soon went into mass production and was highly praised by all reviewers.

Today, however, even Kremlin favor is no final guarantee to a publisher. The favorites may lapse from grace. Also a new book by a man who continues in favor may be found muddle-headed and ideologically harmful by some Central Committee or Politburo member after the head of a publishing concern accepts the book, the Glavlit okays it, papers print enthusiastic reviews by leading literary critics, and it becomes a best seller. The damage is aggravated by the fact that, due to a shortage of plays and original scenarios, a successful novel is usually adapted for the stage, and a film based on the book is made, frequently before its ideological sins are discovered. Then hell breaks loose.

The Russians have a word for the Kremlin logic—*partyinost,* stemming from the word party, which demands that all problems be viewed through the prism of Communist philosophy and practice as currently interpreted by the Politburo. Never in the history of the Soviet Union and its Communist party has *partyinost* been voiced so urgently and irrevocably as today. And the stress on it grows in intensity along with the mounting fierceness of the cold war.

The crystallization of the *partyinost* stage in Soviet thought has caused the problem of Dostoyevsky to raise its sphynx-like head once more. A challenging problem to literary criticism the world over, Dostoyevsky has been a veritable nightmare to Soviet critics. His immense, self-contradictory, and provocative contribution to Russian thought and literature causes a wave of controversy every now and then, invariably

following the entrenchment of a new period in the zigzag evolution of Soviet thought. Such a period has asserted itself with a vengeance right now, and it was touched off by the publication early in the year of three new books on Dostoyevsky. Two of them, *The Young Dostoyevsky* and *F. M. Dostoyevsky,* are by Vladimir Kirpotin, a veteran Soviet critic who has miraculously survived many a story. The third, *In Dostoyevsky's Creative Laboratory,* is by A. Dolinin. The books have all the earmarks of having been written and printed before the recent intensification of *partyinost.*

What interested me was not the drubbing the two critics received but the application of *partyinost* to Dostoyevsky. Writing in the *Literary Gazette* of which he is editor-in-chief, Vladimir Yermilov stated the case bluntly:

> Contemporary bourgeois literature is mobilizing all its forces to bestain and cover with mud all things human, to prove the weakness, insignificance and contemptuousness of human nature. The very essence of man is filthy and despicable—this is the foul thesis bandied about by the literary agents of world reaction. They depict mankind as a cruel and vulgar mass of slovens, each and every one of whom nurses within himself an evil spider, a criminal, a murderer. Mankind must be bridled. Therein lies the significance of the frenzied slander on man, comprising the major content of current literature abroad.
>
> This literature seeks to corrupt the souls of men, to crush their will to fight, and to justify the insane violations to which the rulers of the bourgeois world are subjecting people. A bitter irreconcilable *struggle for man* is raging between progressive and reactionary literature. The progressive camp is led by our Soviet literature.
>
> What role does Dostoyevsky's creative work play in this struggle? To whose camp does he belong?
>
> Our criticism must give a clear, unequivocal answer to these questions. Just as during his lifetime, also now Dostoyevsky stands in the vanguard of reaction. His works are being exploited widely and universally in the frenzied *campaign against man* undertaken by Wall Street's literary lackeys. And it is natural that this should be so, because Dostoyevsky wasted the entire force of his talent on proving the weakness, insignificance and vulgarity of human nature.

Some criticisms of the immortal writer have been even more stern. Still, the Kremlin has not completely rejected Dostoyevsky. As a matter of fact, he is frequently spoken of even in Russia today as a genius, some of whose works belong to the golden treasury of world literature. Critic

David Zaslavsky has pointed out for the guidance of Soviet literary criticism what remains acceptable in him: "With genuine satiric poison he depicted the ways of the capitalist bourgeoisie and bureaucracy. He knew how to arouse the sympathies of the readers with the humiliation and pain of little people crushed by capitalism."

* * *

In his policy-making speeches on the arts, the late Andrei Zhdanov held before the creative men of the Soviet Union visions of greatness which they are to share with the rest of their country that is building a new civilization and establishing new relationships among men. He said:

> If feudalism and, later on, the bourgeoisie in the periods of their flourishings could create art and literature asserting the new systems and praising the flourishing of these systems, then surely our new socialist system embodying all the best in the history of human civilization and culture is capable of creating the most advanced literature which will leave far behind the best creations of olden times.

But a wish alone is not sufficient. Nor can *ukases* to the effect that great works of art be written accomplish that sublime aim. What is needed is freedom, the "right to err" without fear of reprisal. Also needed is unhampered intercourse with creative minds the world over, despite the possibility that these minds may leave their imprint. But the Bolshevik God is a jealous God, and a God of vengeance. For fully two years before his death in the late summer, 1948, Zhdanov headed a campaign of policing the arts in Russia which used every possible weapon—criticism, direct and indirect economic pressure, and in extreme cases the purge.

The Kremlin itself has confessed to the failure of this campaign. Hardly a speech, article, or official pronouncement comes out without lamentations on the state of the arts in the Soviet Union. Even if one uses exclusively the Soviet press as a criterion, one must arrive at the conclusion that Soviet plays performed by the country's great theatres are mediocre; the novels printed are inferior; art exhibitions are unworthy of criticism; literary criticism is inept and cowardly.

But what could Zhdanov and company expect? How can artists soar to heights of inspiration when they are placed in strait jackets of fear?

Soviet artists must not:

Create "non-political" works;

Show appreciation of anything foreign;

Criticize the Party Line or the leaders in the remotest way;

Be purely lyrical or be pessimistic.

On the other hand, Soviet artists must:

Rebuff "the hideous slanders and attacks against our Soviet culture" and expose and attack bourgeois culture (Zhdanov);

"Stress the ideological and human superiority of our people brought up by our socialist regime" (Simonov);

Participate dynamically in the achievement of the current objectives of the Soviet Union be it the Five-Year plan, reconstruction, or a hate-America campaign.

The beginning of the current Party Line in the arts is usually associated with Zhdanov's pronouncement in September, 1946, condemning the Leningrad literary magazines *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* for their non-political outlook, and the subsequent expulsion of humorist Mikhail Zoshchenko, and poetess Anna Akhmatova, from the Union of Soviet Writers.

But the actual beginning probably goes still further back, to the day, late in 1945 or early 1946, when Stalin called in the leading writers to the Kremlin and talked to them for hours. That was Stalin's first post-war conference with writers, and all Moscow was excited by reports about it. Details were contradictory, depending on whether you got the story from your secretary and chauffeur, from a writer you happened to talk to at an official reception, or from a friend active in the art world. Here is a synthetic picture, with details obtained from various sources, all of which agreed on the main points.

One day about one hundred authors received an invitation to the Kremlin. The literati, very much excited, donned their best clothes, and gathered in a small hall, wondering who was going to talk to them, and about what. Stalin appeared unheralded, cut short what was going to be a tumultuous and lengthy ovation, and launched a tirade on the shortcomings of the Soviet literary output. In his talk he revealed an excellent firsthand knowledge of the activity of most of the men gathered there, giving an annihilating resumé of their works. His main thesis was that the literary output in the Soviet Union did not begin to compare with the epic quality of the titanic wartime effort of the workers and peasants, and the legendary exploits of the soldiers and officers, and that they were slow in turning to a portrayal of postwar life and problems.

He accused the writers of lack of patriotism, of seeking luxuries, of permitting themselves to be swayed by foreign influences to the extent of being proud of wearing foreign-made clothes.

One report had it that immediately following Stalin's speech, one of the writers presented a resolution appealing to the group to abandon kowtowing before "zagranitsa." All raised their hands in favor, revealing the possessors of these hands to be dressed to a man in foreign-made clothes.

Stalin also reproached the writers for greed, mentioning their passion for "fountains." Everybody roared with laughter, for they knew he referred to the late Alexey Tolstoy who "liberated" a palace in Bessarabia of a well-stocked wine cellar and a fountain ensemble, and brought it all, complete with statues, to his summer place in a Moscow suburb. Tolstoy, by the way, was of the Count Tolstoy family, and behaved like a Tzarist Russian aristocrat. His brother was once reported to have said to callers: "Sorry, His Highness has just departed for a Communist Party meeting."

Responding to Stalin's invitation to discuss the state of affairs in Soviet literature, some writers offered the excuse that their creative energies were drained by the war. Others suggested that the war was still with them, and they could not turn quickly enough to new themes. They flattered Stalin by saying that glorious Soviet reality was always ahead of them. And no one dared to blame regimentation and controls.

Near Independence Square

By DAN G. HOFFMAN

June-bugs hum against the gleaming panes
where evening window-shoppers drift and pass;
those beetles' buzzing gathers to a roar
that shakes the catkins down the scented air.
Their thrumming drones dirigibles of sound
which all but burst the narrow street apart.
Now idle footsteps gather to a crowd
where children clap & dance & cry aloud:

ii

Three little fellers with a pickle-keg drum
An' a couple a sticks beat to Kingdom Come!
One to holler, another to beat,
An' the third one shuffles with his flat black feet!

iii

Two dozen feet are tapping to his time,
their bodies swaying all in equipoise
to the dark limbs of that liquid boy.

They drink him in until their pulses make
involuntary music with his own.
It surges underfoot, rising to break,

pounding, pounding on the inner shores
of flesh to sound on down the blood's deep course.

iv

My baby lef' me lonesome . . . she is nowhere to be found . . .
"Here's a quarter, nigger-boy. Let's see you scoop it off the ground!"
Liquid limbs freeze rigid, stiffen out of time
To stoop for coins that roll about in guttermuck and grime.
The surging wave is shattered. All feet that danced before
Trample dancing underfoot.

The musicale is over.

The poetry of DAN HOFFMAN has appeared in *The Saturday Review of Literature* and *Voices*. He lives in Philadelphia.

A DOCUMENTARY

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

By E. W. KENWORTHY

The trouble came without warning. And to begin with, it didn't come from the State Department. The exact date was Tuesday, February 17. I had arrived at the office early. The Department was scheduled to begin hearings on Thursday before a House Appropriations subcommittee, and as usual our office was in a lather getting together last minute material to justify budget requests. There was a letter on my desk when I arrived. The envelope was unopened and marked "Personal and Confidential."

The letter was from the House Un-American Activities Committee. It merely said that a matter had come to the committee's attention which they hoped I might be able to clear up, and asked me to appear before a subcommittee the following morning at 10 o'clock in Room — of the old House Office Building. It was signed by the chief investigator for the committee.

I was puzzled by the committee's request. After what had happened last year in "the case of the ten," I was naturally nervous. And yet on reflection I felt I had nothing to be anxious about. There was nothing even faintly pink in my background. I had been investigated by the FBI when I entered the Department in 1942. There had been no hitch, and my security clearance had come through in record time. Nor had I had any trouble when the Department combed its files to furnish information on all employees for the Central Master Index which the President had ordered the Civil Service Commission to set up in March, 1947.

I was at the old House Office Building a few minutes before ten the next morning. Room — turned out to be the office of the committee's

---

E. W. KENWORTHY has had a variety of experience, in college teaching (Indiana University), newspaper work *(Baltimore Sun)*, and government service (as First Secretary of the American Embassy in London handling press information). At present he is on the staff of *The Reporter*, a new magazine of politics and economics to be published in Washington in the spring. "Without Prejudice" is perhaps best described as a story that could be true.

chief investigator. When I entered, a young man about twenty-five with square bunched shoulders, square jaw, and square neck was dictating to a rather pretty redhead in a dark green dress, tightly fitted, the square, low neckline just revealing the rise of her breasts. I had a momentary feeling that somehow Dick Tracy and Daisie Mae had got mixed up in the same comic strip.

He came forward and said, "Are you Charles Davidson?" I said I was.

"I am Mr. Fitzgerald. I thought I recognized you from your picture in the file. I am an investigator for the committee and have done some work on your case. I will be present this morning at the questioning."

Before I could ask him what he meant by my case, the door opened and three men entered.

"Here are the members of the subcommittee now," said Fitzgerald.

I recognized the three Congressmen. Green and Stafford were Republicans, I remembered, though at the moment I couldn't recall their states. Wirtz, the third member, I knew something about. He was a Democrat and had been county prosecutor of Milford County when I had lived in Milford and taught there at the state university extension. He had a local reputation as an orator, specializing in "foreign isms," and had been in demand for Elks smokers, Rotary luncheons, and Legion affairs. Wirtz had been elected to Congress in 1942, just before I came to Washington and had been assigned—at his own request, I was told—to the Un-American Activities Committee. He had been re-elected twice, and in 1947 he had been placed on the Appropriations Committee.

When Fitzgerald had introduced me to the Congressmen, he said, "Well, gentlemen, if you are ready, we can get busy," and led the way into an inner office, furnished with a heavy conference table and five or six wooden armchairs around it. The walls were bare except for autographed photographs of Martin Dies, Parnell Thomas, and J. Edgar Hoover. The pretty redhead came in and sat down at a stenotype machine.

The reader will already have discovered that I am not a professional writer. Therefore I think the best way for me to recount what ensued is to set it down in straight question and answer form. I was never given a transcript of the hearing, and I can't vouch for the verbatim accuracy of what follows. But the sequence of the testimony and the substance of the questions and answers are an accurate reproduction. And so indelibly

is that morning impressed on my memory, so often have I lain awake at night reconstructing the smallest detail and inflection of voice, that even in phrasing I believe I have not departed far from the actual testimony. I scarcely need tell the reader that, for obvious reasons, I have protected the real people who figure in this testimony with fictitious names. Because I do not have the transcript, I have had to give the Congressmen the same protection.

* * *

WIRTZ—You are probably wondering, Mr. Davidson, why you have been asked to appear before this subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I will say briefly and candidly, then, that some time ago certain reports reached the committee, from sources which I am not at liberty to divulge, suggesting that by reason of certain past activities and former associations, there might be room to doubt your unqualified devotion to American institutions of government and the American way of life, and raising the question whether a person with such a background should be entrusted with a key position in one of the most vital and sensitive departments of the federal government.

You understand that this committee is not charging you with anything, and that it merely seeks to give you the opportunity to clear away any doubts we may have.

To begin, then, Mr. Davidson, would you tell the committee what your present position is and how long you have held it?

DAVIDSON—I am assistant chief of the Personnel Bureau in the Office of Administrative Services, in the Department of State. I was promoted to that position in November, 1945.

WIRTZ—What did you do before that?

DAVIDSON—I was on the staff of the Personnel Bureau. I have worked in that office since I entered government service in December, 1942.

WIRTZ—What did you do before coming to Washington?

DAVIDSON—I was a college instructor in Milford, at the state university extension center.

WIRTZ—In my own constituency, then?

DAVIDSON—Yes, sir.

WIRTZ—What did you teach at the university extension center?

DAVIDSON—Sociology, applied psychology, and personnel management.

WIRTZ—What is the nature of your work in the State Department?

DAVIDSON—The Personnel Bureau processes applicants for jobs.

GREEN—That is, you hire personnel.

DAVIDSON—No. We only start them on their way.

WIRTZ—But it is a responsible position.

DAVIDSON—I think it is.

WIRTZ—Do you interview those going into the top echelons?

DAVIDSON—No. Important positions are held by career men, or they are filled on the recommendation of the heads of divisions.

WIRTZ—Do applicants for such jobs as code clerks and filing clerks pass through your hands?

DAVIDSON—Yes, sir.

WIRTZ—And those people see all the cables and the confidential memoranda?

DAVIDSON—I believe they do, in the course of their work.

WIRTZ—Are these people hired on your recommendation?

DAVIDSON—We pass on their qualifications, yes. The actual hiring is done by the officer in charge.

WIRTZ—But your office does the preliminary screening? You can reject a code or filing clerk, or send him along with a recommendation, can you not?

DAVIDSON—Yes.

WIRTZ—*Holding out a newspaper clipping.* Did you ever see this photograph before?

DAVIDSON—Yes, I have.

WIRTZ—*Passing the clipping to the other members.* Will you explain that photo to the other members?

DAVIDSON—It is a picture of a picket line in front of the Milford City Hall.

WIRTZ—Are you in that picket line, Mr. Davidson?

DAVIDSON—Yes, I am.

WIRTZ—Where?

DAVIDSON—There, in the front line.

WIRTZ—Holding that large four-sided sign?

DAVIDSON—Yes, sir.

GREEN—Do I understand, Mr. Davidson, that while you were a member of a state university faculty—on the public payroll, in fact—you took part in a picketing of your municipal government?

DAVIDSON—I was picketing against the actions of the mayor and the city council, yes, sir.

WIRTZ—Mr. Davidson, that sign you are holding says: "THE AFL WANTS IT! THE CIO WANTS IT! WE WANT IT TOO!" Would you tell the committee what it was you wanted badly enough to picket the city hall?

DAVIDSON—A slum clearance project.

WIRTZ—And who are included in the "we"?

DAVIDSON—That referred to the Citizens' Group, which we had formed to lead the fight to secure better housing in the Mexican and Negro quarters across the tracks.

GREEN—You still haven't said who composed this "we."

DAVIDSON—There were a lot of people—social workers, school teachers, several Protestant clergymen, officers in local unions, a few lawyers, some contractors and builders, and the Republican county chairman.

STAFFORD—The Republican county chairman! What was his business?

DAVIDSON—He was a contractor.

STAFFORD—Oh!

DAVIDSON—I am sure that had nothing to do with his support of the project. He was a very public-spirited man.

GREEN—You mean for a Republican?

DAVIDSON—No, sir. He was connected with many civic enterprises.

STAFFORD—Is he in the picture?

DAVIDSON—No. He was a very shy man.

WIRTZ—Do you recognize any of the people in this picket line?

DAVIDSON—Yes, several. The man just behind me is Jerry Cooney. You must have known him, Mr. Wirtz. He headed the city welfare department in Milford at the time.

WIRTZ—Oh, yes. Cooney, if I remember, was the man who was always making speeches about "the least of these." Is that right?

DAVIDSON—He did use that phrase sometimes, yes. He was an emotional man, and very religious. The welfare job was more than just a job to Jerry.

WIRTZ—I always thought the man a radical and a trouble maker. Was he a friend of yours, Mr. Davidson?

DAVIDSON—Yes, a close friend.

WIRTZ—I see. Was Alan MacDonald also a close friend of yours?

DAVIDSON—No, only an acquaintance.

WIRTZ—Is he in that picture?

DAVIDSON—Yes, he represented the Steelworkers.

WIRTZ—Was MacDonald a Communist?

DAVIDSON—I can't say. I only knew him slightly.

WIRTZ—Have you any opinion about MacDonald's political views?

DAVIDSON—Well, I suppose you could say they were generally leftist. He always seemed to have a grievance against society. He had wanted to go to college, but his family needed his help. He was very bright, and had read a good deal, especially in history and economics—socialist economics.

WIRTZ—You know all this, and yet you say you knew MacDonald only slightly?

DAVIDSON—Yes.

WIRTZ—Do you know that MacDonald is now active in the state organization for Wallace?

DAVIDSON—No, but it doesn't surprise me.

GREEN—Mr. Davidson, when did all this take place?

DAVIDSON—In 1938, I think—possibly 1939.

FITZGERALD—It was 1939, Mr. Green.

GREEN—What I don't understand is why you were picketing the city hall. The local government had nothing to do with this. Federal funds paid for slum clearance projects.

DAVIDSON—The federal government had already earmarked a million dollars for Milford. The city officials wouldn't accept it.

GREEN—Wouldn't accept it! Was it a Republican administration?

DAVIDSON—No, sir. Democratic.

GREEN—I can hardly believe that.

DAVIDSON—The city officials were largely Polish-Americans—the Mayor and Council. The slum dwellings across the tracks were owned principally by Polish-American realtors and bankers. The realtors had meetings in the parish hall and explained—in Polish—that the project would have to be paid for by local real estate taxes. Of course, this was not true.

WIRTZ—Mr. Davidson, I must protest your explanation. I know it is not true.

DAVIDSON—I am sorry, Mr. Wirtz, I know it is true.

WIRTZ—Do you know Polish?

DAVIDSON—No, but a number of my students who were present at such meetings told me.

WIRTZ—Many of my most loyal constituents are Polish-American. If the city administration opposed the slum clearance project, it was because they had looked into the matter and found it not in the best interests of the city.

GREEN—Well, all that aside, Mr. Davidson, do you think it was right to picket your government?

DAVIDSON—I see nothing wrong in it, though I will admit now that it was an ineffectual way to exert pressure. But we were desperate. We had worked two years to get the million dollars, and we saw it slipping away. The federal government had given the city just 24 hours more to change its mind before giving the money to another city.

WIRTZ—Mr. Davidson, when you lived in Milford, did you know a man by the name of Alec Thorgensen?

DAVIDSON—Yes.

WIRTZ—Intimately?

DAVIDSON—Well, we were friendly. I saw quite a bit of him at one time.

WIRTZ—Did you and your wife ever visit in his house?

DAVIDSON—Yes, several times.

WIRTZ—And did Thorgensen and his wife ever visit at your house?

DAVIDSON—Three or four times, I should think.

WIRTZ—What did Thorgensen do when you knew him?

DAVIDSON—He was a union organizer—CIO.

WIRTZ—When did you first meet him?

DAVIDSON—During the slum clearance fight. He worked with the Citizens' Group.

WIRTZ—And you continued to see him after that?

DAVIDSON—Yes.

WIRTZ—Was this Citizens' Group a continuing organization? Did it interest itself in civic matters after the slum clearance dispute?

DAVIDSON—No. There was some talk of its becoming permanent. But it fell apart.

WIRTZ—Then you knew Thorgensen first in the Citizens' Group and later as a friend. And in no other capacity?

DAVIDSON—Yes, sir. We were associated—that is, we were both involved in—a strike at a local plant.

GREEN—Mr. Davidson, do I understand you to say that as a state university instructor you not only picketed city halls but participated in strikes?

DAVIDSON—I didn't say that. I said I was involved in a strike.

GREEN—Very well, involved. How were you involved? And why?

DAVIDSON—In an investigatory capacity.

WIRTZ—Mr. Davidson, I think you had better explain to the committee just what you mean.

DAVIDSON—Alec Thorgensen came to me one day and said he had pulled the men at the Crumpacker plant out on strike. He said there were three issues in the strike—wages, vacations with pay, and health conditions in the plant. The men were complaining of dust, and claimed that several men had died from it.

STAFFORD—What did this plant manufacture?

DAVIDSON—Crumpacker's was a refractory. It made silica brick to line the open hearth furnaces in the steel mills.

GREEN—Then the men were charging the dust gave them silicosis?

DAVIDSON—Yes, sir. They didn't call it that. They just said they got "dusted." Thorgensen said he was willing to bargain on pay rates and vacations, but he felt the question of silicosis was a public health problem and shouldn't be bargained about. He said if the Ministerial Association—a group of Protestant clergymen—would make an independent investigation, the union would abide by whatever findings and recommendations the ministers made.

GREEN—How do you come into this, Mr. Davidson?

DAVIDSON—I am coming to that. I was upset by the ministers' statement. They had agreed to investigate health conditions. They had no business, I felt, to pass on the merits of the strike, or to recommend that the men go back to work. In the second place, their investigation had been superficial. At any rate, my wife and I decided to conduct an investigation of our own.

GREEN—Just a minute. Did you get a leave of absence from the university to make this investigation?

DAVIDSON—No. I did it in my spare time.

GREEN—Did it occur to you that the Crumpacker Company was a taxpayer in your state, and as such it was paying your salary as a teacher and had every right to demand that you confine your activities to teaching?

DAVIDSON—The citizens of Milford were also paying my salary, Mr. Green, and—

WIRTZ—Continue with your story, Mr. Davidson.

DAVIDSON—I began by making a list of the men who had died at the Crumpacker plant—as many as the oldest employees could remember. We checked these names against the death records. We couldn't check back more than ten years because there had been a fire in the city hall. We found that over ten years somewhere between 70 and 80 men—I can't recall the exact figure now—had died from silicosis. And this plant had never employed more than 200 men at one time.

GREEN—Was silicosis entered on the death records as the cause of death?

DAVIDSON—No, sir. Most of the doctors had put down "pneumonia," "lobar pneumonia," or "tuberculosis."

GREEN—Then how are you justified in saying these men died of silicosis? Do you presume to know more than the doctors?

DAVIDSON—A dusted worker rarely dies from silicosis. His congested lungs lower his resistance. He usually dies of pneumonia or TB. The only doctor who consistently assigned silicosis as a cause of death was a Negro physician, and he usually added, "Contracted at Crumpacker plant."

GREEN—Were many of the men at this plant Negroes?

DAVIDSON—Yes, more than half, I should say. There were a good many mountain whites also, from Kentucky and Tennessee. The rest were Hungarians.

WIRTZ—You know, of course, that Negroes are peculiarly susceptible to lung trouble. The same is true of migrant whites from the South.

DAVIDSON—That doesn't alter the fact that men got dusted in that plant.

GREEN—You haven't established that as a fact.

DAVIDSON—I also examined the death records at the county TB sanatorium. There the records showed silicosis as well as TB. I still have the photostats of those records.

STAFFORD—But some of these records were ten years old. The ministers said conditions were presently healthy.

DAVIDSON—Mr. Stafford, I asked the union to send a sampling of the men into Chicago for X-rays by a specialist. Out of the eighteen men sent—it may have been sixteen—there were six badly dusted, all men who had worked at the plant several years, and several who were slightly dusted.

The doctor said there was little hope for the six unless they immediately stopped working in the plant.

WIRTZ—*Holding up an unfolded paper.* Did you ever see this paper? It is *The Liberator,* formerly published in Chicago. On page three, there is a feature article, entitled "Crumpacker Plant a Death Mill," and written by one Milton Epstein. There are pictures of the plant and the picket line, with the caption: "These workers may leave Crumpacker's feet first." Mr. Davidson, did you have anything to do with that article?

DAVIDSON—I didn't write it, if that's what you mean. I gave Epstein some of the facts he used. He was a reporter.

WIRTZ—Did you know Epstein?

DAVIDSON—No.

WIRTZ—Was *The Liberator* a Communist publication?

DAVIDSON—I don't know. I only saw this one issue.

WIRTZ—You knew it was a radical publication?

DAVIDSON—That's obvious.

WIRTZ—Did you ever think Alec Thorgensen was a Communist?

DAVIDSON—I never thought much about it. I knew he was left, of course. And he was an apologist for the Soviet Union.

WIRTZ—And it never entered your mind whether he was a Communist?

DAVIDSON—I wasn't particularly interested. That was in 1939.

WIRTZ—You say you were connected with this strike only as an independent investigator. But the article in *The Liberator* refers to you as if you were in the service of the union.

DAVIDSON—Then that statement is wrong.

WIRTZ—Did you ever address the union?

DAVIDSON—Yes, once, possibly twice. The strike had gone on for over three months and the men were weakening. I urged them to hold on.

WIRTZ—Do you think that was the act of an independent investigator?

DAVIDSON—No, I don't. It was a mistake. I was afraid my work would go for nothing, and the company would escape without putting in new machinery to exhaust the dust.

WIRTZ—Did you ever receive any pay from the union?

DAVIDSON—No.

WIRTZ—Nor from the parent CIO?

DAVIDSON—No.

WIRTZ—Now, Mr. Davidson, I want you to think carefully. Did you ever receive any money from the union?

DAVIDSON—No. I have told you that.

WIRTZ—Any gift, any remuneration of any kind?

DAVIDSON—Yes. When the strike was over, the men chipped in and gave me a set of Sandburg's *Abraham Lincoln, the War Years.*

WIRTZ—Just a minute, Mr. Davidson. During the time you knew Alec Thorgensen, were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

DAVIDSON—No.

WIRTZ—Or a secret Communist cell?

DAVIDSON—No.

WIRTZ—Or a so-called Communist front organization?

DAVIDSON—No.

WIRTZ—Or any discussion group—at the university or elsewhere—which was, or might have been, controlled or dominated by Communists?

DAVIDSON—No.

WIRTZ—Think carefully, now. No discussion group whatever?

DAVIDSON—The only discussion group I ever attended was the Left Book Club.

GREEN—The Left Book Club! What was that?

DAVIDSON—It was a group of young instructors and professors on the campus—historians, economists, sociologists—who met once a month to discuss the monthly release of the British Left Book Club.

GREEN—And what, may I ask, was the British Left Book Club?

DAVIDSON—It was run by Victor Gollancz and Harold Laski. They chose a book—either new or a reprint—each month, which Gollancz printed, and this was distributed to the subscribers to the Left Book Club.

WIRTZ—Mr. Davidson, how long did you attend this Left Book discussion club?

DAVIDSON—I went only once—possibly twice. It was at the campus, that's a long way from Milford. I went around with a friend when I happened to be down there.

WIRTZ—And you never went more than twice?

DAVIDSON—No. I was bored with all their ideological cant. None of them knew a thing about politics—practical politics, I mean.

WIRTZ—I want to ask you one or two questions about practical politics,

Mr. Davidson. I have here a cartoon. It is not from a newspaper. It is a broadside. It depicts, as you see, a lynching. A figure—presumably a Negro, though the drawing is very crude—is hanging from a tree. The caption, in rough lettering, reads: "Down South they lynch your kids. Up North they want your votes." Did you ever see that drawing before?

DAVIDSON—No.

WIRTZ—Mr. Fitzgerald, have you that newspaper clipping? Fine. Would you read it to the committee, please.

FITZGERALD—Yes, sir. *(Reading)* "Well, folks, the local Demos gave that poor old elephant another awful shellacking this week. And if you want your uncle's opinion, the GOP in this town got just what it asked for and no more than it deserved.

"The local GOP was so desperate, they were willing to stoop to anything. And they sure did stoop plenty. They went out and bought themselves a perfesser to run their campaign for mayor. This was the same perfesser who tried to run his own candidate in the Democratic primary last spring. And you know where his candidate got. Nowhere, friends, just nowhere.

"So the perfesser decided this time he would try his luck with the Grand Old Party. Only this time the perfesser thought up a new wrinkle in the old game of politics. It was called 'race riot.'

"On election day thousands of handbills were distributed in front of the polls. These handbills had a cartoon on them, showing a Colored Man swinging from a tree. And under the drawing, it said: 'Down South they lynch your kids. Up North they want your votes.' Get it?

"Well, there wasn't any trouble. But not thanks to the perfesser. We can thank the Colored People of this community who know a phony when they smell one."

WIRTZ—Mr. Fitzgerald, where did you get that clipping?

FITZGERALD—It is from the *Milford Weekly Advertiser,* November 6, 1942. The column I read was written by Mr. George Roach, the owner and editor.

WIRTZ—Mr. Davidson, does that column ring a bell in your memory?

DAVIDSON—Yes, I think I still have a clipping somewhere.

WIRTZ—This committee has no grounds to suspect you of being a Communist, or of ever having been one. But incitement to racial strife, Mr. Davidson, is a Communist tactic with which we are very familiar.

GREEN—And so is harping on lynching.

DAVIDSON—I told you I had never seen that cartoon before.

WIRTZ—You will admit you are the professor to whom Mr. Roach refers.

DAVIDSON—I have no doubt about it, though he took care not to mention my name.

WIRTZ—You admitted you were aware of the cartoon's existence?

DAVIDSON—Only through Roach's column.

WIRTZ—Are you suggesting—

DAVIDSON—I am suggesting nothing, Mr. Wirtz. I am stating plainly and unequivocally that I had nothing to do with that cartoon, that Roach is a liar, and that I think the drawing as vile as you do. I don't know what this committee is trying to prove, but—

WIRTZ—Mr. Davidson, I have known George Roach a long time. I have never found him anything but a man of his word, a fine American, and a loyal Democrat.

DAVIDSON—You are certainly entitled to your opinion.

WIRTZ—Mr. Davidson, I demand that you support that innuendo.

DAVIDSON—Very well. Roach's paper is a throwaway. It depends heavily on county "legals" to make money. Roach had always been a Republican. He lost the legals when the Democrats came in in 1932. That's when he became a loyal Democrat.

STAFFORD—Is this man Roach an enemy of yours?

DAVIDSON—I don't harbor any love for him.

STAFFORD—Did you ever quarrel?

DAVIDSON—Yes, if you want to know. I refused to give Roach any political advertising when I was working for two candidates in Milford. Roach sent for me, and asked why I didn't give him advertising. I told him frankly I didn't like what he stood for.

GREEN—This is getting nowhere. I assume, at least, that Roach was correct in attributing political activity to you while you were a teacher.

DAVIDSON—I have said I worked for two candidates for mayor.

GREEN—A Democratic candidate in the primaries and a Republican candidate in the fall?

DAVIDSON—That's right.

GREEN—You seem to be as politically flexible as Mr. Roach.

DAVIDSON—Mr. Green, I was interested in one thing—getting rid of a corrupt city administration.

WIRTZ—Once again I must ask you to substantiate your loose accusations.

DAVIDSON—Milford, as you know, Mr. Wirtz, was a wide open town. A so-called "syndicate" ran the organized vice, gambling and numbers rackets. The head of the syndicate paid for protection.

STAFFORD—And how did you propose to stop this?

DAVIDSON—Perhaps I couldn't. But I made both the men I worked for agree to give me an absolutely free hand. In the fall campaign I hired a photographer to take pictures of several houses of prostitution and gambling halls. I used the pictures in full-page newspaper layouts with captions like: "Mr. Mayor, you say you run a clean city. Here are some addresses your police chief missed."

STAFFORD—Were you successful? Did you close the houses down?

DAVIDSON—No, sir. After one ad, the local Republican leaders went to their candidate and told him I was killing the goose that laid the golden eggs. I didn't know about this then. All I knew was, the paper refused any more ads—on the grounds they were undignified.

STAFFORD—But where were the county officials?

DAVIDSON—The situation was the same as in the city. The Mayor ordered the police chief not to arrest, and consequently the police court judge didn't convict. In the county the sheriff didn't raid, and the county prosecutor didn't have to prosecute.

WIRTZ—Mr. Davidson, are you aware that you are speaking of my congressional district?

DAVIDSON—Yes, sir.

WIRTZ—And during the time to which you refer, I was prosecuting attorney of Milford County?

DAVIDSON—I do not mean to be impertinent, Mr. Wirtz, but how many—

WIRTZ—Gentlemen, every word this witness has uttered about the government of the city and county of Milford is an obscene fabrication, made out of the whole cloth. With your permission I move to strike this part of the testimony from the record. Mr. Davidson, I think we have exhausted the questions we wished to ask you. That is all.

* * *

From the fact that Wirtz, a minority member of the committee, took charge of the questioning, it seemed obvious that somebody back in Milford had set the congressman on me. And yet, despite Wirtz's unfriend-

liness, I came away from the hearing convinced that I had handled the whole absurd business very well.

The next couple of weeks I had little time to think about the hearing. The Department was having hard sledding in the Appropriations subcommittee. Wirtz was particularly tough, demanding a detailed justification for every dollar and questioning the need of one program after another. I was working nights and weekends, getting figures together on job requirements. When I received no further word from the committee, I decided I had heard the last of the matter.

Then suddenly I was asked to appear before the Department's Personnel Security Board. The board went into my connections with Thorgensen in great detail. When it was all over, the board reported that it had found nothing to support charges of disloyalty. But in view of certain past activities and associations, the board felt I was a potential security risk. Because of the responsible nature of my work in the Department, it therefore recommended that my connection with the Department be severed, and that I be allowed to resign without prejudice.

I appealed the decision to the President's loyalty board in the Civil Service Commission. On reviewing the testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee and the Department's security board, the President's committee found nothing to justify my release and advised that I be reinstated. The State Department insisted, however, on its right—under the McCarran rider—to ignore the President's board. I resigned.

So far my job hunting has been fruitless. Wherever I apply, I am asked where I last worked and my reason for leaving. My explanation —that I left the Department to get more money—doesn't ring true. A man with a wife and two children doesn't throw up a $6,500 job for something better unless he already has something better offered to him.

Invariably a flash of doubt crosses the interviewer's face, and he hastens perfunctorily through the remaining questions. It doesn't help matters when I nervously and rather too pointedly produce my State Department severance slip. "Resigned without prejudice" may have a hidden meaning these days.

BOOKS

Road to Survival

Road to Survival. By William Vogt. William Sloane Associates, 1948. $4.

Professor Cross, writing elsewhere in this issue of the *Review,* includes an evaluation of William Vogt's book which is extremely perspicacious and just. There would be no point to further comment here were it not for a violently critical article that recently appeared in *Time,* and were it not for my own impression that people are inclined to dismiss Vogt's testimony *in toto* as the worries of a pessimist.

The situation which leads to these critical attitudes may be very simply described. We Americans entered the world's richest remaining storehouse of resources. Our growing ideals of political freedom permitted most of us to help ourselves freely. The growing industrial revolution allowed us to do this with unprecedented "efficiency." Thus we converted resources to money in record time, and attained a standard of living that is the envy of the world. Business leaders generally take immense pride in this. Social leaders generally criticize the process only to the extent that the wealth has been unfairly distributed. So both conservatives and liberals are shocked when the scientist says it can't last, at least on the same basis. Conservatives cry "Red," and say the scientist doesn't understand democracy, while liberals shake their heads concerning this "specialist" who probably is unappreciative of social values. Such reactions remind one of the man headed for a nervous breakdown who quits his doctor when advised to change his habits.

Road to Survival is packed with scientific data, difficult of assimilation by people unfamiliar with biology, pedology, climatology, and geography. Most readers are therefore likely to skim over the irrefutable but intricate evidence and then recoil, unbelieving, from the harshly realistic concluding chapters. Yet the evidence is documented in detail. Vogt's own research, though considerable, is but a small proportion of the whole. In rejecting *Road to Survival,* readers are rejecting a sterling array of foremost scientists, all cited in the extensive bibliography.

Critics charge that Vogt neglects the potentialities of modern technology. The possibility of mending the nutrient and hydrologic cycles by utilization of sewage he mentions briefly just three times in the book. Genetic improvements, to increase yields, are cited but once; new methods of tillage are but hinted at. Hydroponics is dismissed as economically still out of the question. Vogt's point is that such measures require more time and capital than we can afford, if we depend on them alone.

I think the point is well taken. To put trust in methods not yet feasible is to promote a misleading sense of security and to stifle practical action that could be taken now. That way certainly lies disaster. Soil Conservation Service figures report that 100,000,000 acres of United States cropland have already been destroyed by erosion; and that despite all measures undertaken to date, 115,000,000 acres more *(one quarter* of our remaining cropland) will be gone within the next fifteen years. This con-

tinuing ruin could be stopped in the United States this year, if all landowners could have the knowledge, willingness, and capital to take the proper methods. The "if" is of course too big; but does the discrediting of Vogt's testimony help to reduce it?

Another reason for the incredulity with which *Road to Survival* is received is the global outlook of the book. Credit for this outlook must also be shared with *Our Plundered Planet* by Fairfield Osborn. Even those of us who have followed conservation literature are not accustomed to this scope. We have talked in terms of American forests, American farm surpluses, American ranges, and American population. Even the Latin Americans do not enter our conservation reckoning, much less the rest of the world. By revealing to us our blind provincialism, Vogt opens our minds to some very suggestive political theses: (1) democracy is the fruit of abundance, dictatorship grows from despair; (2) the few nations with relative abundance cannot hope to remain at peace in a starving world.

Vogt realizes only too well that worldwide conservation cannot move fast enough to reduce our mounting political perils; he therefore suggests worldwide birth control. To most of us, it seems that this is equally difficult of attainment, and that therefore Vogt has failed in his effort to map a *Road to Survival*. (Lest the reader despair entirely, let him first read Professor Cross's article.) It is conceivable, however, that Vogt's idea may someday be cited as a landmark in the progress toward an ecologically balanced world. Conservation heretofore has largely been in the hands of the foresters, the soil scientists, the plant ecologists, and the game protectors. All have thought in terms of preservation and production. Now we have the contribution of an animal ecologist, used to thinking in terms of population in balance with resources. It may well be that Vogt has supplied the missing piece for the ultimate solution of the conservation problem.

Of course it is the application, not the solution in theory, that concerns most of us, as Vogt points out at great length. Nevertheless, he says, "A conservation program . . . rests like a tripod on three legs: research, education, and action on the land." The leg which is just now too short is education, as is so clearly explained by Professor Cross. Yet research must always precede education. I submit for the reader's consideration this suggestion: That the earlier conservation movement inspired by Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot was not stopped by conservative William H. Taft. It stopped for lack of know-how. The movement was amateurish; our ablest scientists were busy in other fields. Conservation became associated in the public mind with "preserves," wildflower leagues, and women's clubs. When at last the land sciences received the attention of professionals, a body of knowledge accumulated that went into practice when Franklin Roosevelt created the next opportunity.

Let us not therefore promote conservation education at the expense of research. If this seems an unnecessary admonition, I make it because of a current tendency of liberal people to regard scientists with fear. One hears of the amoral specialist, devising new weapons of atom bombs, guided missiles, and bacteria. It would be more true to say that scientific effort is still out of balance. The emphasis has been on those sciences serving industry, communication, and medicine, rather than

those which feed us and assess our human ecology. We have been under the impression that food is procured by dollars, that more dollars come from industry than from land, and have directed our technology to that end. Even our interest in biology has been predominantly in that portion which strives to cure our aches and pains. How little we realize here in America that perhaps three quarters of humanity's pains are those of hunger!

So let us not condemn science. The scientist is the modern pioneer. True, pioneers were often not particularly gifted in social insight. It is important that the educators and organizers of society should follow closely behind to consolidate the gains of the pioneer. But without this pioneer there would be no gains to consolidate—gains which are indispensable to survival.

Antioch College KENNETH HUNT

Gandhi's "Confession"

Gandhi's Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments With Truth. By Mohandas K. Gandhi. Translated from the original in Gujarati by Mahadev Desai. Washington, D.C.: The Public Affairs Press, 1948. $5.

Shortly after the close of World War I, while India was swept by mass demands for home rule, Gandhi's friends asked him to write his autobiography. He was then not only a national but also an international figure. Sojourns in prison during the early '20's provided most of the leisure Gandhi required for writing; and weekly instalments of his life, written in his native Gujarati, appeared in the periodical *Navajivan*. Subsequently, those instalments were published in book form in Gujarati. Mahadev Desai, often called Gandhi's Boswell, translated the work into English, and it was published in 1927-1929 under the title *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. After a lapse of some twenty years, it has been published for the first time in this country, with the original title as subtitle.

In this autobiographical work, Gandhi's professed aim was not the narration of his life story as such but the exposition of the development of his moral and religious beliefs. One is immediately reminded of Tolstoy's *Confession,* for both are accounts of a soul in search of itself.

Central in position and first in time was his concept of *brahmacharya:* conduct leading to God—"control of the senses in thought, word and deed." Carnal love (one again thinks of Tolstoy) was, to him, the first obstacle to the *brahmachari*. So, at the age of thirty-seven, Gandhi ended carnal relations with his wife and followed that renunciation with the removal of all sense-stimulating articles from his diet. He simplified—or, at least, attempted to simplify—his life by reducing his dependence on others. While still a barrister in South Africa, he began to launder his own shirts and cut his own hair; at neither was his success remarkable. But, in his belief, self-restraint was not an end in itself; self-restraint meant the liberation of self from selfish love to permit an all-encompassing love which would, in turn, lead to God and to *moksha* (literally, freedom from birth and death).

Each element in Gandhi's moral-religious system was directed toward the same end, all-encompassing love. The doctrine of *ahimsa,* nonviolence or compassion for all living things, re-

quired the practice of vegetarianism as well as the abstention from violence toward all animate beings, the fly as well as the British soldier stationed in India. Gandhi realized that the line between *himsa,* violence, and *ahimsa* was so fine that no human being could live without crossing that line and that the practice of *ahimsa* could be no more than an approach to perfection. Hindu belief, he felt, was closer to *ahimsa* than Christianity, for it preached compassion for all beings, whereas Christianity restricted compassion to humanity.

The doctrine and practice of *satyagraha* (literally, thought firmness, generally known as civil disobedience) was formulated during the latter part of his South African stay. On the eve of World War I, the successful application of *satyagraha* in the struggle for the repeal of legislation discriminating against the Indians made Gandhi a hero in India and enabled him to command a great following there at the end of that war. *Satyagraha*—which, by the way, is more fully described in Gandhi's *Satyagraha in South Africa* than in the *Autobiography*—gained currency as a political weapon. Gandhi, however, professed more interest in its moral than in its political aspect. To be fit for *satyagraha,* he asserted, one must first achieve inner purity. Civil disobedience was not the weapon of those too weak for violence but of those who had achieved inner strength, self-control, voluntary observance of just laws, and a love for all which leads to compassion for the sinner and hatred only for the sin.

Gandhi's search for truth led him on many roads. Missionaries, visionaries, faddists, and cranks sought him and were sought by him. He listened and read. What he accepted became part of his system, a system basically Hindu despite many Western additions. In Ruskin's *Unto This Last,* Gandhi found a new tenet: "That a life of labor, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman, is the life worth living." That belief served as a stimulus in his founding of a communal settlement in which all the elements of his faith, including that of *aparigraha,* non-possession, could be fused into a way of life. In a communal settlement one could—and Gandhi did—follow one's beliefs without interference.

By 1914, Gandhi had reached his major conclusions and had formulated his own program for living, a program which he changed but little in the latter part of his life. Consequently, the fact that the *Autobiography* ends in 1921 does not impair the value of the book.

Was Gandhi a *Mahatma,* a crank, a reactionary politician hiding behind mystic incantations; or was he, as Winston Churchill called him, a "half-naked fakir"? Those questions may be debated for years to come. But the reading of *Gandhi's Autobiography* leaves one with the conviction that he was a formidable man, formidable in his search for perfection and in his power over self and others. Whether or not he was a saint is another matter. Sainthood is in large part a matter of milieu and time. Our own culture has little place for latter-day saints. A Gandhi, among us, would undoubtedly be a crank, turning inward as the cultural environment became hostile. Among the Indians, however, he found a response which enabled him to grow and become even stronger.

It seems clear, too, that Gandhi's fame was, at least in part, the product of the political struggle of his time. He wrote:

> My experiments in the political field are now known, not only in India, but to a certain extent to the "civilized" world. For me they have not much value; and the title of "Mahatma" that they have won for me has, therefore, even less.

Perhaps Toynbee was right in asserting that the Indians "revere him as a saint, but they follow his guidance in so far as he resigns himself to leading them along the path of Westernization." To Gandhi an obituary which stated that his political influence transcended that of his moral-religious system would have seemed sad indeed, but such may be the judgment of history.

Gandhi's way of life is, however, still a matter for debate. A few have imitated him in practice. Many have praised him verbally in the way that one would praise any dedicated person for his diligence and self-control, irrespective of the aims to which that person had dedicated himself. But what of those aims? Are they congenial or worth-while? Many, in the West at least, feel that the ultimate goal of Gandhi's thinking, all-embracing compassion, is an end which all should seek, but that Gandhi's means to achieve that end are not always congenial. His stiff-necked puritanism and his preoccupation with the visible signs of invisible grace may lead not to love but to arrogance. One wonders whether complete denial of self is not a less desirable form of preoccupation with self than is normal living. One wonders, too, whether Gandhi's simplicity was as simple as he painted it. Skeptics point out that it was sometimes necessary to set up a special train in order that Gandhi might keep his vows and ride third class; that, on the eve of his arrival in a city, many workmen might be required to prepare a simple hovel for him. One wonders, but the answer is not too clear. The practice of saint-hood is often as trying for non-saints in the proximity of saints as it is for the saints themselves.

There can be no denying of Gandhi's eminence. G. B. Shaw once remarked, in his usual style, that he and Gandhi belonged to a select group and that one such as Gandhi came but once in a thousand years. Shaw on Gandhi may be prescient.

Gandhi's Autobiography is a powerful and compelling book. It is a work of such simplicity and force that the realization of the skill and art which went into its making are not clear until one has read it all. Here Gandhi's own words speak so simply and eloquently that one feels exegesis and biography by others to be almost superfluous.

SIDNEY HARCAVE

Associated Colleges of Upper New York, Plattsburg, N.Y.

Book Notes

Lincoln's Herndon. By David Donald. Alfred A. Knopf, 1948. $5.

This cleverly titled biography of the author of *Herndon's Lincoln* can be read, and, as several book clubs like to emphasize, treasured. It is written with a wit, knowledge, and sense of proportion rare among Lincoln fanciers. It is perhaps not sufficiently realized how few trained historians have investigated Lincoln, and how scarce have been candid and impartial studies. How many people, for instance, know that Lincoln once appeared in court in behalf of the *master* of a fugitive slave?

William H. Herndon, Lincoln's law partner for thirteen years before the Civil War, was the most important of all the early biographers, and was responsible for the dubious Ann Rutledge story, controversies over Lincoln's paternity, religion, and other questions of personal and public import. The life of Herndon and the story of his book are interesting in their own right and lose nothing by Mr. Donald's careful treatment; the tragedy and human nature revealed tell us a good deal about Lincoln's milieu. Carl Sandburg contributes his usual introduction.

The History of Nora Beckham: a Museum of Home Life. By Joseph Stanley Pennell. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948. $3.

A sequel to the well-selling *History of Rome Hanks,* this latest history seems to have been well-received, critically, and perhaps also from the sales department standpoint. Authentic and apparently inexhaustible detail about American life, circa 1900-1925, and judiciously concupiscent pages have no doubt contributed to Mr. Pennell's good reception. He has, however, more to offer than research and sex: he ponders life and death with a feeling for words and experience, and to a purpose Thomas Wolfe may not always have grasped.

Very striking is the total lack of anything approaching "social significance" in Mr. Pennell's work. Teddy Roosevelt, for example, is just the face on the Bull Moose button. Have we rejected the novel of Narcissus and the "class conscious" novel only to walk in darkness with our storytellers? Mr. Pennell seems to think that courage and decency have consequence, even when they are not rewarded. What else he believes remains to be seen.

Two-way Street: the Emergence of the Public Relations Counsel. By Eric F. Goldman. Bellman Publishing Company, 1948. $1.25.

A too-brief essay, it is nevertheless suggestive by reason of its scholarly marshalling of pertinent data. Its impact is too light by reason of its unwillingness to get down to cases. It is no revelation that the public relations counsellor is "here to stay." The subject would be advanced a little further if we learned whether, for example, Public Relations Counsellor Ivy Lee did or did not deserve the nickname "Poison"—and why.

The Chips Are Down. By Jean-Paul Sartre. Lear Publishers, 1948. $2.75.

A lively scenario, its theme echoes the problem posed by Sartre's *No Exit.* The present story (it will soon be seen in America as a motion picture) will interest persons who wonder whether a movie scenario can be art in its own right: a question which has also recently been posed in Aldous Huxley's horrific *Ape and Essence.* Sartre's current effort reminds one that he is a writer of genuine talent, rational appreciation of whom has been confused by the pretentious babble of literary existentialism. Sartre is not a philosopher; he is a storyteller, who reminds one curiously of the early Ben Hecht of *Erik Dorn* and *Humpty Dumpty:* a nihilist and cynic who also took to fooling with supernatural themes, as, come to think of it, Aldous Huxley has, too.

The Legacy of Sacco and Vanzetti. By G. Louis Joughin and Edmund M. Morgan. Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1948. $6.

This is in some ways the most important book of the year, for anyone

who takes his liberalism seriously. Employing a scientific technique, the authors seek to plumb the meaning of the great case. Professor Morgan comes to grips with the legal evidence, Professor Joughin with the social and literary circumstances involved. The effect of this examination is cumulative and impressive, and may be of pioneer significance to liberals and litterateurs who are in search of evidence that truth can be sought, and that it can make us free.

The Diary of Pierre Laval. With an Introduction by His Daughter, Josée Laval, Countess R. de Chambrun. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948. $3.50.

Here is a volume to make one rub one's eyes. Laval the patriot, Laval the humanitarian, the protector of the Jews, the Communists, the Freemasons —Laval, in short, the savior of France, scarcely to be distinguished, if one can believe him, from the fighters of the Resistance. What is one to make of his notes, prepared for his own legal defense (the word "Diary" in the title is a singular misnomer)? It must be noticed immediately that Laval was a master of courtroom forensics, able to change his tactics with ease and rapidity, to "appeal to reason" as readily as to feeling. Here, with his back to the wall, he attacks vigorously, and is likely to astound the reader with his fluent, forceful assertions and accusations.

His great weakness in cold print is that he proves too much. For example, he was not responsible for the Armistice of 1940, but it may well have been the first Allied victory! Laval draws disturbing pictures of a German tide flowing down to the Straits of Gibralter and over into North Africa, and asks what this might have meant to the American counteroffensive. The reader for whom the events of the time have lost clear outline can readily begin to doubt his own sense of the situation. It is a sobering thought that an unscrupulous debater like Laval can confidently assume that readers are forgetting everything they have ever read.

There is a trick to Laval's discourse, and that is to take from a situation whatever he can use, and douse it with his alleged good intentions. Accordingly, he can claim to have had no need for public office, since he was rich and had already held the highest positions. He can argue for all opportunists who ever bet on the wrong horse that he had had only the public weal in prospect. He can claim anything. His feelings toward England were cordial. He would have continued the fight from North Africa if it had been possible. He resisted Germany on all key questions, rendering himself unpopular and suspect.

A second feature of his defense is brazenly exploited and merits the most thoughtful consideration. Who, after all, was a traitor to the interests of his country? Was Laval more of a traitor than the Chamberlain of Munich? Was Darlan, with whom the United States officially dealt, less of a traitor than he? Laval seeks, in short, to identify himself with those who, to one degree or another, compromised with, accepted, or were indifferent to fascism and retained their standing in the democratic countries. Had Laval received a fair trial, he would have made it difficult for his accusers. His career was a judgment on democracy; it needs to be understood. It would be a mistake to satisfy oneself with denunciations of him, or by ignoring him.

Intruder in the Dust. By William Faulkner. Random House, 1948. $3.

Faulkner's new novel bids fair to arouse more controversy than any other of his works since *Sanctuary,* and principally because of the presence in it of certain extended remarks which formally, at least, represent the opinions of several of the characters. The following is a sample:

"I don't know [Sambo] at all and in my opinion no white man does but I do know the Southern white man not only the nine hundred and ninety-nine but that one other [the lyncher] too because he is our own too and more than that, that one other does not exist only in the South, you will see allied not North and East and West and Sambo against a handful of white men in the South but a paper alliance of theorists and fanatics and private and personal avengers. . . . And when you say [the Negro] Lucas must not wait for . . . tomorrow because that tomorrow will never come because you not only can't you won't then we can only repeat Then you shall not and say to you Come down here and look at us before you make up your mind and you reply No thanks the smell is bad enough from here and we say Surely you will at least look at the dog you plan to housebreak. . . ."

The point is that Faulkner is more than a dispenser of opinions on the Negro question in the South, and there may be deeper and more spontaneous insights than are represented by the above ideas, whatever may be Faulkner's relationship to them, or by the fact that the story itself is a hundred per cent on the side of the Negro in the case. Faulkner's prose may be a bit of a nuisance to the uninitiated, but it will repay the patient reader in terms of something closely approximating a whodunit plot, a frustrated lynching, and the ideas of a gifted and not unrepresentative Southerner.

LOUIS FILLER

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946, of The Antioch Review, published quarterly at Yellow Springs, Ohio, for October 1, 1948.

State of Ohio, County of Greene:

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the state and county aforesaid, personally appeared Paul Bixler, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Chairman of the Editorial Board of the Antioch Review and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily, weekly, semiweekly or triweekly newspaper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946 (section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations), printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Antioch Review, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio; Chairman of the Editorial Board, Paul Bixler, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Managing Editor (None); Business Manager, Max Astrachan, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) The Antioch Review, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio, a non-profit corporation.

3. That the known bondholders, mortagagees, and other security holders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is ———. (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

(Signed) Paul Bixler

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 30th day of September, 1948.

(My commission expires October 18, 1948.)

(Signed) Miriam L. Dickinson

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

takes pride in the publication of a major contribution to American literary history . . .

Literary History of the United States

Edited by Robert E. Spiller, Willard Thorp
Thomas H. Johnson, Henry Seidel Canby

Forty-eight contributors—including such distinguished names as H. L. Mencken, Carl Sandburg, Joseph Wood Krutch, Allan Nevins, Henry Steele Commager, Malcolm Cowley, and many others—have joined their efforts to make this a complete critical, biographical, and historical record of American literature and its makers.

Here, in three volumes, is a magnificent history, beginning with the earliest known fragments of New World writing and concluding with the rich, complex flowering of our literary culture today. The first two volumes examine every facet of our literature. The third volume is a unique bibliography of tremendous range.

This invaluable work will be welcomed by every author, scholar, student of our literature. It will find its way into all libraries and into the homes of those who wish to understand and preserve our American heritage.

Complete set, $20.00 Volumes I and II, boxed, $15.00

Bibliography, $7.50

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11

Boston Chicago Atlanta Dallas San Francisco